

# The Review of English Studies

---

VOL. XVI.—No. 62.

APRIL, 1940.

---

## THE MOUSE-TRAP AGAIN

BY C. J. SISSON

It is a matter of much importance to know how Shakespeare's plays should be acted. I am not, for myself, inclined to urge that this is of supreme importance. The drama was certainly the medium of Shakespeare's art, and the stage was the vehicle whereby his work of art was first published. But we may properly raise the question what *was* the work of art which we are to call Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Was it the thing which Shakespeare wrote down on pieces of paper, the raw material for a stage-play? Or was it the thing which finally emerged in speech and action on the stage? (One may set aside fanciful notions, such as that which trifles with the absolute idea of the *Hamlet* that Shakespeare conceived, remote from considerations of language, dramatic form, or histrionic possibility.) It is a real dilemma. We know, of course, with reasonable certainty not only that Shakespeare was a competent craftsman of the theatre but also that he had a hand in the progress of his work from the study to the stage. But we can be sure enough that the process of adapting a play of his for the stage was no formality, nor was it in his own hands. It was, as always, a process of some difficulty and delicacy, and was a matter for expert co-operative effort, however competent or distinguished the dramatist might be. The original prompt-copy, indeed, it might be argued, was the work of Shakespeare and

others. It would be a great assumption to maintain that the final result, thus attained, was entirely under his direction, to his taste, or even with his agreement at all points. One need hardly indicate the further problem of interpolation between the original copy and its original stage-form, as well as in the subsequent history of the prompt-copy. "The Lady of the Strachy" in *Twelfth Night* is an almost certain instance. Thus it may be that the conception of the "prompt-copy" as the ideal copy for a play of Shakespeare is far from the poet's own thoughts about his work.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the play of *Hamlet* points in an opposite direction. It is accepted that the 1604 Quarto and the 1623 Folio represent a text that is authentic Shakespeare in the main at least. And it is accepted that the length of the text precludes any claim that it represents the prompt-copy of the play as acted originally or subsequently in Shakespeare's own time. We have evidence enough that dramatists wrote more "copy" for plays than the stage could digest. Surviving manuscript plays show how ruthless was the necessary pruning that went to the achievement of a satisfactory prompt-copy. Yet the marks of deletion rarely stood in the way of any subsequent printer of the original copy. And it is clear that such copy occasionally went to the printer. So it was with Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, whose printer recorded "divers things . . . that the length of the Play would not bear in the Presentment." Ben Jonson, again, made no bones about destroying the prompt-copy of his *Sejanus*, sending to the press a new copy from which the share of his unnamed collaborator in the stage-play was removed and replaced by his own substitute work, in order that all might be his own, to stand or fall before posterity on his own legs. And so it was, beyond doubt, with the copy for the 1604 *Hamlet*, in particular, though we could adduce other instances from Shakespeare's own work.

What, then, was the thing which Shakespeare would have certified himself as his "poem"? For we must not forget that the writer of plays was, in the language of the day, the "Poet." There was some hesitation or diffidence about claiming high-sounding names for plays, it is true, and Ben Jonson's "Works" evoked some unkind merriment. But a score of indications show how the wind was blowing, and while there is no reason for eliminating Shakespeare from the ranks of men with literary ambitions there are twenty reasons to the contrary.

The question is sufficiently open to debate for us to enter a caveat against too much insistence upon the practical problems of the production of Shakespeare's plays, especially with our imperfect knowledge of Elizabethan production and acting. When we put the question, What happens in *Hamlet*? we may, after all, properly define *Hamlet* as words written on pieces of paper by Shakespeare rather than things said and done by Burbage and his fellows. Is it not reasonably clear that the authoritative texts of *Hamlet* do, in fact, answer to the former of these definitions rather than to the latter?

So far, then, for a statement of a general principle which appears to me to need consideration to-day, and which may explain with what hesitancy I approach the problem of the Mouse-Trap scene, apart from the danger of coming between such fell opposites as Dr. Lawrence, Dr. Greg, and Professor Dover Wilson. But I am convinced that here it is a question of missing stage-directions and that it is, above all, a "producer's problem."

We may conclude in the first place that the theatrical test or the theatrical criterion must be applied with the greatest caution. Such a practical piece of criticism as that which produces *Hamlet* with the omission of the Dumb-Show, in order to attain verisimilitude on the modern stage, passes all bounds of reason. The Dumb-Show is there in every form in which the play has come down to us, and one of these versions is especially good evidence that it was actually performed in the theatre. But even if it had not been so performed, we should have been concerned with Shakespeare's intentions and with his conception of the scene. It has to be accounted for.

A second caveat should be entered against the application of the theatrical test where it is applied under the influence of modern habits of thought and technique, modern conditions of illusion, and that modern intimacy of production which permits complexity of dramatic intent. The solutions of the problem of the Mouse-Trap offered by Professor Dover Wilson and Dr. Greg appear to me to be unacceptable on these grounds. Wilson postulates a Dumb-Show presented in full view before the King. The King is, indeed, the chief spectator, as Dr. W. W. Lawrence pointed out. Yet, as Wilson sees it, the King's attention is completely distracted from this affair right in front of his nose, presented especially for him, so that he is entirely unaware of its purport. There is no dialogue and no stage-

direction to hint at this extraordinary piece of stage-business and this grievous discourtesy on the part of the King and his satellites. Nor does Hamlet do anything about it. Wilson is obliged to add to his theory the notion, taken from Greg, that the Dumb-Show was an unwelcome impromptu by the Players, an extraordinarily complicated notion which what we might call the "score" of the play does not support comfortably. So, again, Greg's notion that the Dumb-Show and Play were either proof of the falsity of the Ghost's revelation or irrelevant, at all events that they did not revive the actual incidents of the past, would make the scene more proper to the comedy of an elaborately unsuccessful amateur detective failing to unmask the villain than to the deadly tragedy of *Hamlet*. Consider Desdemona's handkerchief! Or Imogen's mole! And then consider whether Shakespeare could have proposed to himself this complex irony in this kind of matter. The more we meditate this solution to which the difficulties of the scene drive Dr. Greg, with all its enormous implications, the more we see that it revolutionizes not only *Hamlet* but the Elizabethan drama and stage.

Even Dr. Lawrence's interpretation of the scene makes considerable calls upon our theatrical imagination, and one may well hesitate to accept it as consistent with the comparative straightforwardness and directness of Elizabethan stage effects. It may well be that Claudius was a man of courage and dignity who could have supported the first application of torture with fortitude, only to break down upon a second application of the rack. And we may recall the note of King James which prescribed just such a second application *ad ima* to Guy Fawkes, in search of truth and confession. But it appears to me to be an unnatural piece of theatre for Shakespeare. And I fail to find any indication, as I am sure there would have been, of Hamlet's purpose and of his comments upon the progress of his efforts. Moreover, I am, as others have been, concerned about the King's apparent ignorance of the purport of the action about to begin, when the Dumb-Show has already declared it. Surely the King "doth protest too much" as well as the Player-Queen for such an interpretation. Hamlet apparently accepts that he is ignorant of the story and gives him a sly, sinister hint. This interpretation also appears to me to be too "highly sophisticated," to use Dr. Lawrence's own phrase.

The fact is that any modern producer might well be glad to be rid of the Dumb-Show, and so far we may agree with Professor Wilson



and Mr. Gielgud. Without it, if it were possible to eliminate it, the scene is simply and logically consistent and effective, creates no difficulties, and omits nothing of apparent dramatic importance to-day. But it is there and it cannot be eliminated. And the truth is that it is indispensable on the Elizabethan stage.

Let us turn to Shakespeare in the study, in the process of writing things on pieces of paper, putting the story that he is telling into dramatic form and poetry. Hamlet is to catch the conscience of the King by the Play within the play which reflects his crime. I conceive the poet writing the Play-scene, not without gusto :

For us and for our tragedy,  
Here stooping to your clemency,  
We beg your hearing patiently.

The action proceeds, but is broken off half-way through its story by the sudden uprising of the King. An earlier or cruder dramatist would have stolidly taken the Play to its end and let the King and the audience have the full benefit of complete disclosure of the aftermath of the poisoning, the fruits of the crime, before proceeding to portray the King's dismay. But Shakespeare hastens the climax of the scene, with far greater dramatic effect. As soon as the fatal word "poison" is reached and Hamlet adds point to the theme, his purpose is attained: "the King rises," and Hamlet and Horatio draw their conclusions together. So Shakespeare arrived at this stage of his work. He then realized that he had completed only one part of his necessary task.

The Play-Scene has a two-fold function. It is a piece of detective work on Hamlet's part, whereby he solves all his doubts concerning the guilt of the King and the truth of the revelation of the Ghost, as well as the origin of the Ghost. But there is another aspect of the matter that has not been attended to, and that Shakespeare had not yet attended to. It is also a means of telling the whole Hamlet-story by a means well known in the modern stage and film as a "flash-back." Even the Ghost's lengthy and rhetorical narrative hardly told the whole story (and, indeed, might suggest a different sequence of events). A chapter in the history of Denmark was to be set forth in the Play, as a sort of belated prologue or exposition, which would at the same time focus and authenticate the Ghost's narrative. But this "flash-back" is necessarily interrupted half-way.

And here it became clear to Shakespeare that something must be

done. Hamlet, of course, knew the complete scenario of the Play. The King did not know it, and it was necessary that he should not know it in order that he should suffer the impact of guilty surprise. But it was necessary that the audience should know it in order that they should share with Hamlet all his suspense and anticipation. We know what Hamlet thought of the omission or neglect of any "necessary question of the play." And we know how laboriously on occasion, as in *Henry V* or *The Tempest*, for instance, Shakespeare ensured the conveyance of full information to his audience. A modern audience appears to enjoy the shock of surprise applied to itself. An Elizabethan audience, to judge by Elizabethan plays, enjoyed surprise applied to the characters in a play. Elizabethan technique, it would seem, made it a general rule not to keep the audience in the dark.<sup>1</sup>

A Dumb-Show was an obvious and a familiar and well-tryed device, to meet the need. With its help the audience would be able to anticipate the course and full significance of the Play and share fully in the excitement. It was, moreover, peculiarly well adapted to fit with the general atmosphere of the performance of the Players, being a somewhat old-fashioned device. I can, for my own part, so far free myself from a modern frame of mind as to conceive myself resenting the breaking-off of the Play, in the desire to know how it would have ended, were it not for the "inside" information already furnished by the Dumb-Show. It will be observed, moreover, that the Dumb-Show contributes additional information, tending to diminish the guilt of the Queen and to increase that of the Poisoner. She "makes passionate action" on finding the King dead. And she "seems harsh and unwilling awhile" to the Poisoner. It focuses, moreover, the motives of the King. Shakespeare therefore went back and inserted the Dumb-Show.

So we may fancy. At any rate, the Dumb-Show is there and was performed, as everyone agrees. And it appears that it was mainly for the benefit of the audience. It appears also that serious difficulties arise—the root indeed of the whole debate—if the King sees it. The audience must see it and the King must not. Is this an instance where a reasonably unsophisticated appeal may properly be made from the thing written, and only partly translated in the poet's mind into actions, words, and groups, to the stage-metamorphosis of the

<sup>1</sup> The Stuart drama, of course, as many instances show, developed a different technique for a more sophisticated audience.

play? Did Shakespeare, indeed, put his problem to his fellows and get a practical answer?

It is clear that the Dumb-Show was seen by the audience and also by Hamlet and Ophelia, who comment upon it, and no one else to our *knowledge*. There can be no reasonable doubt that the Dumb-Show was acted in the inner stage, invisible to a great part of the main stage. Thus I find no difficulty in grouping the characters, leaving the main stage largely free for the Players and their Play, in such a way that the King and Queen in their State, back-stage on one side with their immediate circle, and others ranged back-stage opposite, do not and cannot see the Dumb-Show. Hamlet is specifically placed elsewhere than immediately by the Queen, and the small group of Hamlet and Ophelia are set aside. It is their function here to expound the significance of the Dumb-Show. "It means mischief," says Hamlet, and Ophelia makes it clear that it "imports the argument of the play." The audience realizes what's afoot. The Dumb-Show is by no means "inexplicable," even to the merest groundling. But these brief aside dialogues of Hamlet and Ophelia are not heard by the royal party, any more than the Dumb-Show is seen by them. Otherwise Ophelia's speech

Belike this show imports the argument of the play  
and the King's question

Have you heard the argument? Is there no offence in it?

are too absurdly opposed for reconciliation. Indeed, the King's question is as good as a stage-direction.

Which way, then, lies reasonable stage-illusion, in such a physical invisibility of the Dumb-Show or such exaggerated neglectfulness as has been suggested, which almost involves temporary blindfolding of King, Queen and Court? For my part, I find little difficulty in accepting the convention of, as it were, freezing the action on the outer stage for the short time necessary for the Dumb-Show, with the attention of the audience concentrated upon it and with Hamlet and Ophelia as its stage-audience. Hamlet himself would set the main action afloat again, it is clear, by moving to usher forward the Players and their Prologue as they step forth upon the main stage, with some small ensuing regrouping of the Court circle to include Hamlet and Ophelia more nearly. And the attention of the audience is also redistributed now.

The Elizabethan stage and drama offers examples enough of a large sanction for invisible or unseen action, and of accompanying frozen action, as a convention. My difficulty with Professor Wilson is that his is the wrong interpretation of this invisibility. But it does seem to me that invisibility offers the only satisfactory solution to the real dilemma in which Shakespeare found himself, and which is a more serious stumbling-block to modern readers and producers of the play. And the solution is to be found not in the high degree of "sophistication" which Dr. Lawrence postulates but in the application of a somewhat unsophisticated convention of a highly conventional stage, which had the support of a credulous audience in the maintenance of its stage-illusion.

## THE BANNS OF THE CHESTER PLAYS<sup>1</sup>

BY F. M. SALTER

(Concluded)

### EARLY BANNS

The comen bannes to be proclaymed & Ryddon with the stewardys  
of euery occupacion

Lordinges Royall and Reverentt  
Louely ladies that here be lentt  
Souereigne Citizins hether am I sent  
A message for to say 4

I pray you all that be present  
That you will here with good intent  
And lett your eares to be lent  
Hertfull I you pray 8

Our wurshipfull mair of this Citie  
With all this Royall cominaltie  
Solem pagens ordent hath he  
At the fest of whitsunday tyde 12

how euery craft in his decree  
bryng forth their plays Solemplye  
I shall declare you brefely  
yf ye will Abyde A while 16

### *Tanners*

The worshipfull tanners of thys towne  
Bryng forth the heuenly mancion  
Thorders of Angelles and theire creacion  
According done to the best 20  
And when thangelles be made so clere  
Then folowyth the falling of lucifere  
To bryng forth this play with good chere  
The tanners be full prest 24

<sup>1</sup> See also *R.E.S.* vol. XV, no. 60, pp. 432-57, and vol. XVI, no. 61, pp. 1-17.

<i>Drapers &amp; hosiers</i>	You wurshipfull men of the draperye loke that paradyce be all redye Prepare also the mappa mundi Adam and eke eve	28
<i>waterleaders and drawers of dee</i>	The water leders and drawers of dee loke that noyes shipp be sett on hie that you lett not the storye And then shall you well cheve	32
<i>Barbursurgions and Tallowchandlors</i>	The barbers and wax chaundlers also that day of the patriarche you shall play Abram that putt was to Assay To sley Isack his sonne	36
<i>Cappers and linnen drapers</i>	The cappers & pynners forth shall bryng balack that fears and mightie kyng And balam on An Asse sytting Loke that this be done	40
<i>wryghts and slaters</i>	Youe wrightys and slaters wilbe fayne bryng forth your cariage of marie myld quene And of octavyan so cruell and kene And also of Sybell the sage for fynding of that Royall thing I graunt you all the blessing of the high imperiall king Both the maister and his page	44 48
<i>Paynters Imbrautherers &amp; glasiers</i>	Paynters glasiars & broderers in fere Haue taken on theym with full good chere That the Sheppardes play then shall appere And that with right good wyll	52
<i>marchants and vinteners</i>	The vynteners then as doth befall bringe forth the 3 kings Royall of Colyn or pagent memoryall and worthy to appere there shall you see how thos kyngs all Came bouldly into the hall before Herald proude in paulle of Crysts byrth to heare	56 60
<i>marcers</i>	The mercers worshipfull of degre the presentation that haue yee hit fallyth best for your see by right reason & skyle of caryage I haue no doubt both within and also without	64



THE BANNES OF THE CHESTER PLAYS 139

	it shall be deckyd that all the Rowte full gladly on it shall be to loke with sondry cullors it shall shine of veluit satten & damaske fyne Taffyta Sersnett of poppyngee grene .....	68 72
<i>Goldsmys</i> and masons	The gouldsmys then full soone will hye & massons theyre craft to magnifye theis 2 crafts will them applye theyre worshipp for to wyne how Herode king of Galalye for that Intent Cryst to distrye Slew the Inosents most cruely of tow yers & within	76 80
<i>Smys</i> furbors and Pewterers	Semely Smythis also in Syght a louely Caryage the will dyght Candilmas day for soth it hyght the find it with good will	84
<i>Butchers</i>	The butchers pagend shall not be myst how Satan temped our Sauyour Cryst it is an history of the best as wittneseth the gospell	88
<i>glouers</i>	Nedys must I rehers the glouer the giue me gloues and gay gere the find the Toumbe of Lazarey that pagend cometh next	92
<i>Coruiseurs or</i> Showmakers	Also the Coruesers with all their myght the fynde a full fayre syght Ierusalem their Caryage hyght for so sayth the text	96
<i>Bakers and</i> milners	and the bakers also be dene the find the Maunday as I wene it is a Carriage full well besene as then it shall appeare	100
<i>Coupers</i> Stringers <i>Flechers</i> <i>Bowyers</i> and Turners <i>Ironmongers</i> and Ropers	flechers bowyers with great honors the Cowpers find the Tormentors that bobbyde god with gret horrors as he sat in his chere The yron mongers find a Caryage good how Iesu dyed on the Rode and shed for vs his precyus blud the find it in fere	104 108

- Kookes* Cryst after his passion  
brake hell for our redempcion  
that find the Cookes & hostelers of this towne  
& that with full good chere 112
- Skynners* also the Skynners they be bowne  
*Cardmakers* with great worship & renowne  
*Poynters and* they find the resurection  
*girdlers* fayre maye them befall 116
- Sadlers* Sadlers & Foysters haue the good grace  
*Foysters* the find the Castell of Emawse  
where Crist appered to Cleophas  
a faire pagend you shall see 120
- Taylyers* also the Taylers with trew Intent  
haue taken on them verament  
the assencyon by one assent  
to bringe it forth full right 124
- fyshe* fysshe mongers men of faith  
*mongers* as that day will doe thair slayth  
to bringe there caryage furth in grayth  
wytsonday it hight 128
- Wyues* The wurshipfull wyffys of this towne  
ffynd of our Lady thassumpcion  
It to bryng forth they be bowne  
And meytene with all theyre might 132
- Shermen* The Shermen will not behynd  
Butt bryng theire cariage with good mynde  
The pagent of prophetys they do fynd  
That prophecied ffull truly 136  
Off the comyng of Anticrist  
That goodys ffaith wold resist  
That cariage I warrand shall not myst  
Butt sett forth full dewly 140
- Hewsters* The hewsters that be men full sage  
*or Diers* They bryng forth A wurthy cariage  
That is A thing of grett costage  
Antycryst hit hight 144

THE BANNES OF THE CHESTER PLAYS 141

weyuers & walkers  
 They weyuers in euery dede  
 ffynd the day of dome well may they spede  
 I graunt theym holly to theire neede  
 The blysse of heuen bright 148  
 Souereigne syrs to you I say  
 And to all this ffeyre cuntre  
 That played shalbe this godely play  
 In the whitson weke 152  
 That is brefely for to sey  
 Vppon monday tuysday and wennysday  
 Whoo lust to see them he may  
 And non of them to seke 156

erazed in the booke  
 Also maister Maire of this Citie  
 with all his bretheryn accordingly  
 A Solempne procession ordent hath he  
 to be done to the best 160  
 Appon the day of corpus christi  
 The blessed sacrament caried shalbe  
 And A play sett forth by the clergie  
 In honor of the fest 164  
 Many torches there may you see  
 Marchaunty and craftys of this Citie  
 By order passing in theire degree  
 A goodly sight that day 168  
 They come from saynt maries on the hill  
 the churche of saynt Iohns vntill  
 And there the sacrament leve they will  
 The south as I you say 172

erazed  
 whoo so comyth these playes to see  
 with good deuocion merelye  
 hertely welcome shall he be  
 And haue right good chere 176  
 Sur Iohn Aneway was maire of this Citie  
 when these playes were begon truly  
 god graunt vs merely  
 And see theym many A yere 180  
 Now haue I done that lyeth in me  
 To procure this solempnitie  
 That these playes contynued may be  
 And well sett fourth Alway 184  
 Iesu crist that sytys on hee  
 And his blessyd mother marie  
 Saue all this goodely company  
 And kepe you nyght and day 188

## The Late Banns [MS. D]

The Readinge of the Banes 1600

The Banes which are Reade  
 Bee Fore The Beginninge of the  
 playes : of Chester : 1600  
 : 4 : Iune 1600.

Reuerende Lordes and ladyes all  
 That at this tyme here Assembled bee  
 by this message vnderstande you shall  
 that some tymes there was mayor of this Citie 4  
 Sir John Arnway knighte who moste worthilye  
 contented hym selfe to sett out in playe  
 the devise of one done Rondall moonke of Chester Abbey 7

This moonke not moonke like in Scriptures well seene  
 in storyes Travilled with the best sorte  
 In pagentes set fourth apparently to all Eyne  
 the olde and newe testament with liuely comforth 11  
 Interminglinge there with onely to make sporte  
 some thinges not warranted by any writt  
 which to gladd the hearers he woulde men to take yt 14

This matter he Abrevited into playes twenty foure  
 and every playe of the matter gaue but A taste  
 leavinge for better learninge the Scircumstance to accomlishe  
 for all his proceedinges maye appeare to be in haste 18  
 yet all to gether vnprofitable his labor he did not waste  
 for at this daye and ever he deserveth the fame  
 which fewe monkes deserued professinge that name 21

These storyes of the Testamente at this tyme you knowe  
 in A common Englishe tongue neuer read nor harde  
 yet therof in these pagentes to make open shewe  
 this moonke and noe Moonke was nothinge A freayde 25  
 with fear of hanginge breninge or Cuttinge off heade  
 to sett out that all maye disserne and see  
 and parte good be lefte beleewe you mee 28

- |  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 5 knighte] omit A.                               | 20 and] an A.                       |
| 7 done] omit A.                                  | deserveth] desearued A.             |
| 8 not] omit DR.                                  | 21 ffewe] all DR.                   |
| 10 apparently] apparente A.                      | deserued] deserves DR.              |
| 11] omit A.                                      | that name] the same A.              |
| 14 to gladd the hearers] glad the                | 23 A] omit A.                       |
| hartes A.  | 25 noe] omit DR.                    |
| 15 Abrevited] abreuaited A.                      | A freayde] affrayde A.              |
| twenty foure] (i.e. xxiiij <sup>th</sup> ) (i.e. | 26 hanginge breninge] burninge      |
| foure and twentie) A.                            | hangeinge A.                        |
| 26 A] omit A.                                    | 28 good be left] of good beleife A. |
| 17 learninge] learned A.                         | you] ye A.                          |

As in this Citie divers yeares they haue bene set out  
so at this tyme of penticoste called whitsontyde  
All though to all the Citie followe labour and coste  
yet god giuinge leave that tyme shall you in playe  
For three dayes to gether begynninge one mondaye  
see these pagentes played to the beste of theire skill  
wher to supplye all wantes shalbe noe wante of good will

32

35

As all that shall see them shall most welcome bee  
soe all that here them wee moste humbly praye  
not to compare this matter or storie  
with the age or tyme wherin we presentlye staye  
but to the tyme of Ignorance wherin we did straye  
then doe I compare that this lande through out  
non had the like nor the like dose sett out

39

42

If the same be likeinge to the comens all  
then our desier is satisfied for that is all our gaine  
yf noe matter or shewe therof any thinge speciall  
doe not please but misslike the most of the trayne  
goe backe I saye to the firste tyme againe  
then shall you fynde the fyne witt at this day aboundinge  
at that day and that age had verye small beinge

46

49

Condempe not our matter where grosse wordes you here  
which ymport at this day small sence or vnderstandinge  
as sometye postie lewtie in good manner or in feare  
with such like wilbe vttered in there speeches speakeinge  
At this tyme those speeches carried good likeinge  
tho if at this tyme you take them spoken at that tyme  
as well matter as wordes then is all well and fyne

53

56

This worthy knyghte Arnway then mayor of this Citie  
this order toke as declare to you I shall  
that by twenty fower occupations artes craftes or misterie  
these pagentes shoulde be played after breffe Rehearsall  
for every pagente A Cariage to be provyded with all  
in which sorte we purpose this whitsontyde  
our pageantes in to three partes to devyde

60

63

33 begynninge] begine A.

35 wher] wherein A.

wantes] wante A.

wante] wants DR.

37 here] doe here A.

humbly] humble DR.

40 to] in DR.

did] doe A.

41 then doe] And then dare A.

42 dose] durste A.

44 satisfied] to satisfie DR.

45 any thinge] omit DR.

47 I saye to the firste tyme againe]

againe to the first tyme

I saye A.

51 ymport] Impart A.

at] as A.

52 somtyme] somtymes A.

lewtie] bewtie A.

55 if] omit DR.

56 well] wee A.

is all] all is A.

and] omit A.

57 then] them A.

59 by] omit A.

twenty fower] (i.e. xxiiij) A.

61 to be] omit A.

1. Nowe you worshippfull tanners that of Custome olde  
the fall of Lucifer did truly set out  
some writers Awarrante your matter theirfore be boulde  
Lustelye to playe the same to all the Rowtte 67  
and yf any therof stande in any doubte  
your Authour his Auther hath your shewe let bee  
good speech fyne players with Apparrill comelye 70
2. Of the Drapers you the wealthy Companye  
the Creation of the worlde Adam and Eve  
Accordinge to your wealth set out wealhtilye  
and howe Cayne his brother Abell his life did bereave 74
3. The good symple waterleaders and Drawers of Deey  
see that your Arke in all poyntes be prepared  
of Noy and his Children the wholl storye  
and of the vniversall floude by you shalbe played 78
4. The Sacriffice that faythfull Abraham of his sonne should make  
you barbers and waxe Chaundlers of Aunciente tyme  
in the fourth pageante with paines you doe take  
in decente sorte set out the storie is fine 82  
the offeringe of Melchesedecke of breade and wine  
and the preservation thereof set in your playe  
suffer you not in any poynte, the storye to decaye 85
5. Cappers and lynnens Drapers, see that you fourth bringe  
In well decked order that worthy storie  
of Balaam and his Asse, and of balacke the kinge  
make the Asse to speake and sett yt out livelye 89
6. Of Octavion the Emperour that coulede not well Alowe  
the prophesye of Auncient Sibell the sage  
you wrightes and skilaters, with good players in showe  
lustelye bringe fourth your well decked Carriage 93  
the beirthe of Christe shall all see in that stage  
yf the scriptures a warrant not of the Mydwyses reporte  
the Author telleth his Authour then take it in sporte 96

65 truly] *omit* DR.  
68 thereof] therefore A.  
70 players] playes A.  
76 your Arke in all poyntes] in all  
poyntes your arke A.  
79 of] to DR.  
81 with] with the B.

81 you doe] yee did AB.  
84 preservation] presentation B.  
85 decaye] take Awaye DR.  
86 you fourth] ye A.  
93 well decked] *omit* A.  
95 yf the] In A.  
96 in] *omit* A.



7. The Appearinge Angell and starr vpon Christes beirth  
to sheapeardes poore of base and lowe degree  
you painters and glasiors decke out with all meirth  
and see that Gloria in excelsis : be songe merelye 100  
fewe wordes in that pageante makes meirth truely  
for all that the Author had to stande vppon  
was glorye to god one heigh, and peace on earth to man 103
8. And you worthy marchantes vintners that nowe haue plenty of  
wine  
Amplifye the storie of those wise kinges three  
that through herodes lande and Realme, by the starr that did  
shine  
sought the sight of the saviour that then borne shoulde bee 107
9. And you worshippfull mercers though Costely and fyne  
yee Tryme vp your Cariage as Custome ever was  
yet in A stable was he borne that mighty kinge Devyne  
poorely in A stable betwixe an oxe and An asse 111
10. You Goulde Smythes and Masons make comely shewe  
Howe Herode did Rage at the Retorne of those kinges  
and howe he slewe the small tender male babes  
being vnder two yeaes of Age 115
11. You Smythes honest men yea and of honest arte  
howe Christe amonge the doctors in the temple did dispute  
to set out in playe comely yt shalbe your parte  
get mynstrills to that shewe pipe tabarte and flute 119
12. And next to this you bowchers of this Citie  
the storie of Sathan that christe woulde needes tempte  
set out as Accostamablie vsed haue yee  
the Devill in his feathers all Ragged and Rente 123

98 to] The A.  
sheapeardes] shepparde A.  
100 excelsis] exelsus A.  
101 that] the A.  
makes] make AB.  
102 Authour] Alter DR.  
103 one heigh] Aboue DR.  
on earth to] in earth B.  
104 of wine] omit B.  
105 Amplifye] Amplye A.  
wise] omit A.  
106 starr that] starr A.

108 worshippfull] wor A : worthie B.  
111 stable] stall B.  
114 small] omit A.  
babes] babes beinge B.  
115 beinge] omit B.  
116 yea] omit DR.  
118 in] your A.  
119 tabarte] tabrett AB.  
120 you] you ye A.  
121 christe woulde needes] woulde  
needes Christe A.  
122 vsed] omit DR.

123 Ragged] Ragger DR.

13. The death of Lazarus and his Riseinge Againe  
you of glovers the wholl occupation  
in pagente with players orderly let yt not be paine  
finely to advaunce after the best fashion 127
14. The Storye howe that to Ierusalem our saviour toke the waye  
you Corvisors that in Nomber full manye bee  
with your Ierusalem Carriage shall set out in playe  
A Commendable true storye and worthy memorye 131
15. And howe Christe our savyour at his last super  
gaue his body and his bloude for Redemption of vs all  
you bakers see that with the same wordes you vtter  
as Christ hym selfe spake them to be A memoriall  
of that death and passion which in playe ensue after shall 135  
the worste of these stories doe not fall to your parte  
therefore caste god looves Abroade with A Cheerfull harte 138
16. You fletchers boweyers Cowpers stringers and Iremongers  
see soberly ye make of Christes dolefull death  
his scourginge his whippinge his bloudeshedd and passion  
and all the paines he suffered till the last of his breath 142  
lordinges in this storye consisteth our cheeffe ffayth  
The Ignorans wherein hath vs so manye yeres blinded  
As though now all see the path plaine, yet the most parte cannot  
finde it
17. As our beleeffe is that Christe after his passion  
Descended in to hell, but what he did in that place  
though our Authour sett fourth after his opinion  
yet creditt you the best learned, those he doth not disgrace 149  
we wishe that of all sortes the beste you ymbrace  
you Cookes with your Carriage see that you doe well  
In pagente sett out the harrowinge of hell 152

126 pagente] pagiantes A : pagion B.  
128 howe that] howe AB.  
129 full] omit DR.  
130 Ierusalem] Ierusalems B.  
131 true storye] storye true B.  
worthy] worthe of AB.  
133 and his] and B.  
134 with] omit B.  
the] omit A.  
you] yee B.  
136 ensue after] after ensue AB.  
137 these stories doe] this storye doth  
B.

138 god] Gods A : godes B.  
looves] loues A.  
A] accustomed AB.  
139 Iremongers] Iremongers alto-  
gether B.  
140 of] out A.  
143 consisteth] consisted B.  
144-5] omit DR.  
145 now] omit A.  
146 that] omit A.  
147 did] omit D.  
149 he doth] doth he R.  
150 you] you may A.

# THE BANNS OF THE CHESTER PLAYS 147

18. The Skinners before you after shall playe  
the storye of the Resurrection  
howe Christe from death Rose the thirde daye  
not altered in many poyntes from the olde fashion 156
19. The Saddlers and ffusterers shoulde in theire pagent declare  
the Apperances of Christe his travayle to Emaus  
his often speach to the women and to his disciples deere  
To make his Riseinge Againe to all the worlde Notorious 160
20. Then see that you Telers with Cariage decent  
the storye of the Assention formablye doe frame  
wherby that gloryous body in Cloudes most orient  
is taken vp to the heavens with perpetuall fame 164
21. This of the olde and newe Testament to ende all the storye  
which our author meaneth at this tyme to haue in playe  
you ffishmongers to the peagent of the holy ghoste well see  
that in good order yt be done as hath bene all waye 168
22. And after those Ended yt doth not the storie staye  
but by prophettes sheweth fourth howe Antechrist shoulde Rise  
which you shermen sett out in moste Comely wise 171
23. And then you diers and hewsters Antechrist bringe out  
ffirst with his Docter that godlye maye Expounde  
who be Antechristes the worlde Rounde About  
and Enocke and Hely persons walkinge one grounde 175  
in partes set you well out the wicked to confounde  
which beinge vnderstanded Christes worde for to bee  
Confoundeth all Antechristes and sectes of that degree 178
24. The Cominge of Christe to geue Eternall Iudgement  
you weavers last of all your parte is for to playe  
Domesdaye we call yt when the Omnipotente  
Shall make Ende of this worlde by sentence I saye 182  
one his Righte hande to stande god grante vs that daye  
and to haue that sweete worde in melodye  
Come hether come hether venite benedicti 185

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 155 Rose] arose AB.                      | 167 to the] to that B.                           |
| 157 ffusterers] ffryzers AB.             | ghoste well] crose will B.                       |
| 158 Apperances] appearance AB.           | 169 yt] yet AB.                                  |
| 159 women] woman A.                      | storie] author AB.                               |
| and to] and AB.                          | 171 sett] see sett AB.                           |
| 160 Againe] omit A.                      | 172 you] yee A.                                  |
| 161 Telers] tayleors B.                  | 175 Hely] holye B.                               |
| 162 formablye] formallye A : formerly B. | 176 set you well] well sett you A : well sett B. |
| doe] to B.                               | 178 sectes] sextes DR.                           |
| 163 orient] ardente AB.                  | 180 for] omit AB.                                |
| 166 author] aluter DR.                   | 185 benedicti] benedicite A.                     |



## BEN JONSON IN DRAYTON'S POEMS

BY R. W. SHORT<sup>1</sup>

IN 1606 Michael Drayton, in a new version of one of his old poems, launched a famous attack upon a patroness, whom he called Selena, and a poet then under her protection, whom he called Cerberon. There can be little doubt that Selena was Lucy Countess of Bedford, but who was Cerberon? Rather oddly, F. G. Fleay, who imposed local names upon so many pastoral and dramatic characters of the time, failed to make a stab at this most interesting problem. Since Fleay, however, at least two cases have been presented, one suggesting that Cerberon was Donne,<sup>2</sup> the other that he was Florio. I propose, instead, that he was Ben Jonson. If my case be sound, it will appear that Drayton's relationship with Jonson generally has been misunderstood: they were not friends but enemies, an hypothesis which will assist us to understand other, tangential relationships of the same period.

Since Cerberon was so closely involved with Selena, or Lady Bedford, his identification must be sought in the story of her patronage of Drayton and of the rift which finally separated them. As the strongest points in the case will depend upon factors of time, it will be well first to list the dates of Drayton's dedications to his young patroness.

1594: *Matilda*, inscribed to Mistress Lucy Harington, then in her fourteenth year and about to marry Edward Russell, third Earl of Bedford. That year Drayton dedicated *Ideas Mirrour* to Anthony Cooke, and either then or the year before *Peirs Gaueston* to Henry Cavendish. For several years thereafter all that he wrote was dedicated to Lady Bedford.

1595: *Endimion and Phoebe*, dedicated to Lady Bedford with the sonnet beginning "Great Ladie, essence of my cheefest good."

<sup>1</sup> Owing to the delays in the transatlantic mails, the author has been unable to read proofs.—Ed. *R.E.S.*

<sup>2</sup> "Raymond Jenkins," *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xxxviii, 557-87. This case is invalidated by the fact that Lady Bedford did not patronize Donne's poetry until 1608, hence it will not be discussed here.

1596 : *Mortimeriados*, dedicated to Lady Bedford, with several addresses to her interpolated throughout the poem.

1596 : *The Legends of Robert, Matilda, and Gaveston*, dedicated to Lady Bedford and her mother, Lady Anne Harington.

1597 : The first *Epistle of Englands Heroicall Epistles* (Rosamond to King Henry), dedicated to Lady Bedford. This is a curious dedication, expressing a dissatisfaction with his present condition, which he apparently hopes Lady Bedford will understand without his having to specify. He says, in part :

Heere must your Ladiship behold variablenesse in resolution ; woes constantly grounded, laments abruptly broken off, much confidence, no certaintie, words begetting teares, teares confounding matter, large complaints in little Papers, and many deformed cares, in one vniformed Epistle. I striue not to affect singularitie, yet would faine flye imitation, and prostrate mine owne wants to other mens perfections. Your iudiciall eye must modell forth what my Pen hath layd together : much would shee say to a King, much would I say to a Countesse, but that the method of my epistle must conclude the modestie of hers, which I wish may recommend my euer vowed seruice to your Honour.

This was Drayton's last dedication to Lady Bedford. For several years he wrote no new poems, but devoted himself to writing for the stage. It has sometimes been conjectured that the rift between Drayton and Lady Bedford occurred at this time, and that he was driven by her neglect into dramatic writing, for which he was ill-fitted to succeed. This is reasoning after the fact. We now know that he slaved as a poorly paid drudge of Henslowe, nursing in his heart a growing bitterness against his fate. In the beginning, however, it is unlikely that he felt the antipathy toward dramatic composition that he later developed. Quite probably he hoped that the stage would bring him not only financial independence but release from the situation that forced him to address his poems to other ladies when his lyric muse craved to address only Idea. He had the example of more fortunate dramatists to encourage him in these hopes. Although the above address to Lady Bedford is undoubtedly ambiguous in its terms, he did not at the time intend it to convey any reprehension of her conduct toward him. Its unease proceeds from a general discouragement with his situation that drove him to make a clean break with his former life and plunge into another sphere of literary activity.

Other *Epistles*, dedicated to Lady Bedford's mother and husband,



fully expressed his gratitude for the generous support the Countess and her family had given him.

The date of Drayton's escape from the stage was 1602. Possibly he then applied for the resumption of Lady Bedford's patronage; if so, he failed to get it. At the moment this could not have seemed a serious matter to him; fickleness among patrons was no novelty to the poets of this period, and Drayton, furthermore, quickly discovered another excellent patron in Walter Aston, to whom he began to dedicate his works, beginning in 1603. Nevertheless, he did feel that the defection of Lady Bedford and her selection of another favourite toward whom he was antipathetic entitled him to a mild public demonstration of resentment.

Drayton did little for the stage in 1602; his major poetic activity was a thoroughgoing revision of *Mortimeriados* into *The Barrons Wars*, published in 1603. In this new edition the dedication was made over to Walter Aston and all the internal passages to Lady Bedford expunged. One of the newly inserted passages contains the hints upon which rests the assumption that a rival poet, for some reason displeasing to Drayton, had taken his place as Lady Bedford's favourite; the same passage gives an inkling of the identification of that poet. It is a stanza to Idea, now re-enthroned as Drayton's Muse, wherein he suggests first that the events of *Mortimeriados* had deflected the natural course of his "virgine impolluted rimes":

Altred the course wherein they first begunne,  
To sing these bloodie and vnnaturall crimes,  
My layes had still beene to *Ideas* bowre,  
Of my deere *Ankor*, or her loued *Stoure*.

Then, with no transition, he continues, addressing Aston:

Or for our subiect your faire worth to chuse,  
Your birth, your vertue, and your hie respects,  
That gently daine to patronize our Muse,  
Who our free soule ingeniously elects  
To publish your deserts, and all your dues  
Maugre the Momists, and Satyricke sects,  
Whilst my great verse eternally is sung,  
You still may liue with me in spight of wrong.<sup>1</sup>

If we are to find here the poet, or even the kind of poet, whose association with Lady Bedford has aroused Drayton's sense of harm, our clue is clearly in the line "Maugre the Momists, and Satyricke sects." A line in the dedicatory sonnet to Aston reinforces the

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, London, 1605, p. 47. Unless otherwise noted, quotations are from editions under discussion.

allusion to Drayton's enemies. He speaks of his relationship with Aston as firmer than that which "stands in censure of the common voice,"

That with light humour fondly is transported.

Before attempting the identification of Drayton's rival, let us see what happened to the other poems that had been dedicated to Lady Bedford when they were reissued. *Matilda*, first to be dedicated to her, was combined with the legends of *Robert* and *Peirs Gaueston* in 1596, as we have already mentioned, to make up another book addressed to the same lady. They were next printed with *Poems*, 1605, then with *Poems*, 1608, volumes dedicated to Aston; in both and subsequent editions the dedications to Lady Bedford were removed. *Endimion and Phoebe* was not reprinted until the nineteenth century,<sup>1</sup> though a portion of it was woven into *The Man in the Moone*, which appeared in 1606 in a volume dedicated to Aston. The original dedicatory sonnet to Lady Bedford, however, found its way into collections of Drayton's sonnets in 1599, 1602, 1605, and subsequently. *Englands Heroicall Epistles* came out in new printings or new issues almost every year from 1597 to 1605, and several subsequent years, in each case retaining the dedication of the first *Epistle* to Lady Bedford until 1619, when it was dropped.

The question at once arises, Why did Drayton do away with so many of his various addresses to Lady Bedford after 1603, but permit the dedication of the first *Epistle* of *Englands Heroicall Epistles* and the dedicatory sonnet of *Endimion and Phoebe* to remain? There are good reasons, quite compatible with the notion of a rift in 1602. The sonnet was too good a piece of work to destroy, and detached from *Endimion and Phoebe* it no longer embodied the compliment of a major dedication to its subject. Before the break *Englands Heroicall Epistles* had been so often reprinted with the dedications to Lady Bedford and her family (more often than any other work of Drayton's up to 1603) that Drayton could hardly offer them as fresh flowers to another patron. Furthermore, as we have seen, the dedicatory address to Lady Bedford was couched in querulous terms not inconsistent with his new dissatisfaction with her. It could be continued with no damage to his pride.

<sup>1</sup> Oliver Elton, *Michael Drayton, a Critical Study with a Bibliography*, London, 1905, p. 165.

Then in 1606 a new collection of some of Drayton's shorter poems was entered in the Stationers' Register, under the title of *Poemes Lyrick and pastorall*. There seems to be no reason to doubt that an extant undated book bearing that title is identical with the book thus listed in the Register; hence we assume 1606 to be the correct date of the volume of *Poemes Lyrick and pastorall*, so important to the study of Drayton's relationship with Lady Bedford and the rival poet.

In this publication the *Eglogs* printed in *Idea The Shepheards Garland*, 1593, appear in much revised form, simply as *Eglogs*. A new eighth *Eglog* contains the ill-natured passage in which Lady Bedford as Selena is reviled and cursed for the heartless fickleness with which she has deserted Rowland, or Drayton. Apparently Drayton's old grudge, formerly satisfied with eliminating her name from his *Legends* and the ambitious *Barron Wars*, had been revived in more violent degree by new circumstances. An exhaustive search in the life of Lady Bedford has failed to reveal any act that might directly or indirectly explain this attack upon her in 1606, a time in her life for which it is not difficult to find information, since as Queen Anne's favourite lady-in-waiting she lived rather in a spotlight. Hence a more general cause must be assigned to Drayton's explosion. In general, Lady Bedford was probably not much more desirable as a patron than Walter Aston, whose loyalty to Drayton's epic themes was generous and long-enduring. Yet since 1603 she had gained power in another sphere, where she could be of new service to a well-qualified poet. By 1606 she had attained virtual control over the brilliant Jacobean court masques. In 1604 she chose Daniel to write the first court masque of the new reign, and in 1605 and 1606 exerted an influential, if indeed not final, word in the selection of Jonson as author. Possibly Drayton felt that his gifts, with his laboriously acquired knowledge of the stage, fitted him to contrive these showy spectacles. With his talent for personification, his ability to write dramatically, in passages at least, and his complete denizenship in fairyland, he might indeed have challenged Ben Jonson's pre-eminence in this form if he had been given a chance. If, then, he again petitioned Lady Bedford for her support, this time as a masque-writer, we can understand the rage he felt at being again rejected. But this, of course, is guesswork.

Whatever the case between Drayton and Lady Bedford may have

been, our principal interest now lies in other lines of the eighth *Eglog* of *Poemes Lyrick and pastorall*. Selena deserts Rowland,

And to deceitefull *Cerberon* she cleaues  
that beastly clowne to vile of to be spoken,  
and that good shepherd wilfully she leaues  
and falsly al her promises hath broken,  
and al those beautyes whilom that her graced,  
with vulgar breath perpetually defaced.<sup>1</sup>

These lines, with those addressed to Selena, were dropped when next the *Eglogs* were printed, in 1619.

We need not assume that *Cerberon* must be a member of the "Momists, and Satyricke sects" whom Drayton recognized as hostile to him in 1603, yet we should not be surprised if both calumnies seem to fit a single individual better than anybody else. It is improbable that Drayton had two enemies in these years both associated with Lady Bedford.

Fortunately there is dependable information regarding the writers who were attached to Lady Bedford in 1603 and in 1606. For the earlier date there are only two possibilities, Florio and Jonson; for the latter date, Daniel must be added.

The earlier, less important, reference reads very like a dig at Jonson. The possibility that Drayton meant Florio would hardly need to be considered, except that in 1603 Florio was closely connected with Lady Bedford and that he is a more important candidate for the second reference. Some time around 1594 he became Lady Bedford's tutor. In 1598 he dedicated his Italian dictionary, *Worlde of Wordes*, to Lady Bedford, Rutland, and Southampton, with praise for their mastery of foreign languages under his tuition; and in 1603 he dedicated the first book of his translation of Montaigne's *Essais* to Lady Bedford and her mother. His relationship with Lady Bedford was undoubtedly most friendly, yet he hardly appeared as a rival to Drayton. His connection with her began when Drayton was closest to her, and for several years both relationships continued harmoniously together. Except for Lady Bedford's encouragement of his *Montaigne*, he was more tutor than literary dependent, while Drayton was her acknowledged poet. Finally, Drayton would have no reason to refer to Florio as a Momist or a Satyrist.

By 1601 Jonson had addressed several poems to Lady Bedford, all indicative of great admiration and regard. Mr. B. H. Newdigate has established that Jonson's *Ode ἐνθουσιαστική* among the poems

<sup>1</sup> *Poemes Lyrick and pastorall*, printed for the Spenser Society, 1891, p. 86.

of *Loves Martyr*, 1601, was addressed to her, and has suggested her name as the Phoenix of the rest of the poems in that volume.<sup>1</sup> A copy of *Cynthias Revells*, 1601, contains an inset leaf with a dedicatory poem to Lady Bedford. Jonson's lines to Lady Bedford in an *Epistle* (xii of the *Forrest*) to her friend and cousin Lady Rutland were written about 1601.<sup>2</sup> These lines refer to Drayton as a rival<sup>3</sup> and mention explicitly Lady Bedford's patronage of himself:

Who, though shee have a better verser got,  
(Or *Poet*, in the court account) then I,  
And, who doth me (though I not him) envy,  
Yet, for the timely favours shee hath done,  
To my lesse sanguine *Muse*, wherein she' hath wonne  
My gratefull soule, . . .<sup>3</sup>

That Jonson, at this date, refers to Drayton as Lady Bedford's poet is further evidence that the rift occurred after Drayton's experience with the theatre. In addition to these, Jonson wrote other poems to Lady Bedford, which cannot be dated with sufficient precision to permit use of them in this argument. One is tempted to believe that the poem to her accompanying his gift of Donne's satires, was written around the turn of the century, as the greater number of Donne's satires had been written by 1600.

That Drayton intended Jonson and Jonson's supporters by "Momists, and Satyricke sects" seems most probable. London knew Jonson as one who could "make a stabbing *Satir*, or an *Epigram*."<sup>4</sup> In the *Poetaster*, performed in 1601, he rehearsed at length the virtues of satire and the importance of the satirist, presenting himself as Horace, the master of satire. In the same year Dekker's *Satiro-mastix* attempted to crush the self-proclaimed satirist under ponderous ridicule. Even the loosely used term "Momus" seemed an appropriate epithet for him, perhaps suggested by the fact that one of the more favourably presented characters of *Poetaster*, Harmogenes, attained his apotheosis under the name of Momus.<sup>5</sup>

The identification of Cerberon is more important, for it is more certain that Drayton there had a living individual in mind. Pro-

<sup>1</sup> *The Phoenix and Turtle*, ed. B. H. Newdigate, Oxford, 1937, p. xix *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> See my note in *R.E.S.*, vol. xv, 1939 (No. 59, July), p. 315 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. B. H. Newdigate, Oxford, 1936, p. 75.

<sup>4</sup> John Marston, *Histrio-Mastix*, 1610, II, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Harington's two epigrams "Against Momus," 2 and 219 in *The Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. N. E. McClure, Philadelphia, 1926, were most probably aimed at Jonson.

fessor J. William Hebel has suggested Florio.<sup>1</sup> After having sketched, in more detail than I have given, Florio's position as tutor in the household of Lady Bedford and her encouragement of the *Montaigne*, Professor Hebel mentioned Drayton's hatred of foreigners and concluded :

Drayton probably exulted when he hit upon the name Cerberon, seemingly an adaptation of Cerberus, for that characterized exactly Florio's three-headed dedications of the *Worlde of Wordes* and *The Essayes of Montaigne*. And "beastly clowne" seemed to describe Florio's antics and foreign manner, while "vulgar breath" fitted his ridiculous, florid language.

Against this must be set a fact which it will be difficult to refute. After the *Montaigne*, Florio's relationship with Lady Bedford, then past the need of a tutor, dropped away ; after 1603 we have no evidence that closely links their names. Certainly no connection between them continued that Drayton in any way could consider active literary patronage, let alone a violation of promises of patronage made to him. Equally certainly, Drayton's outburst does not sound like wrath that has lain fallow for three years. Such a notion does injustice even to Drayton's crusty nature. In sum, Florio fits the date of the 1603 reference but not the reference itself ; whereas the reference of 1606 seems possibly to indicate him, but the date practically eliminates him as a candidate.

Since nobody has tried to establish Daniel as Cerberon, there is no need to build up an elaborate case of denial. Lady Bedford's influence upon his writing seems to have been limited to 1603 and 1604 ; but, indeed, one can hardly believe that the violent lines to Cerberon were meant to describe the gentle Daniel.

The just conclusion is that Jonson best fits the facts of Cerberon. By 1606 his friendship with Lady Bedford had ripened through their collaboration in the court masques. Having given Daniel one chance at masque-writing, in 1604, Lady Bedford apparently had decided that none but Jonson should write the subsequent ones. In 1608 we find Jonson circulating among the group associated with Lady Bedford's residence at Twickenham. One might easily have believed that she had ears for no other kind of poetry than Jonson's, that he had enrolled her among the "Satyricke sect," among the "common voice" (cf. "vulgar breath") "that with light humour fondly is transported."

It is not necessary to believe that Cerberon was meant to suggest

<sup>1</sup> "Drayton's Sirena," in *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xxxix, No. 4, 814-36.



Cerberus in any precise way ; yet one could argue that Jonson were as Cerberean as Florio : dramatist, masque-writer, and satirist ; soldier, bricklayer, and poet. The other pejorative epithets, "deceitfull," "beastly clowne," "vulgar breath" may be taken as angry exaggerations of Jonson's less happy qualities no less than of Florio's.

So far, this much has been established : that Drayton's two chief references, one in 1603 and one in 1606, to a writer or writers whom he held partly responsible for the interruption of his connection with Lady Bedford, by their dates fit Jonson, and that the references themselves are not incompatible with what an angry rival might conceivably have written about him ; further, that no other writer, in either case, seems to fit so well *both* the dates *and* the terms of the references. The case must now be approached from another point of view.

Drayton and Jonson have frequently been referred to as friends, yet the closer we examine the evidence of this supposed friendship, the less impressive it becomes. In 1627 Drayton praised Jonson in eight lines in his *Of Poets and Poesie*.<sup>1</sup> Professor Hebel, the editor of Drayton, described these lines as "a cold comment born of Drayton's sense of justice."<sup>2</sup> This is a description of the lines with which one must agree ; they indicate no warmth of regard. Next, Jonson wrote prefatory verses to the volume in which *Of Poets and Poesie* appeared. These Professor Hebel called "sly satire rather than compliment,"<sup>3</sup> again a just comment. Jonson indeed begins by mentioning his own reputation for unfriendliness to Drayton :

It hath beene question'd, *Michael*, if I bee  
A Friend at all ; or, if at all, to thee :

Then follows a review of all Drayton's chief poems, almost though not entirely, in terms of mock praise. At the end he concludes :

I call the world, that enuies mee, to see  
If I can be a Friend, and Friend to thee.

In light of Jonson's treatment of Drayton's works, the answer would seem to be a decisive No ; Jonson had not forgotten that he had been dubbed Momus in 1603 and Cerberon in 1606, or that Sir

<sup>1</sup> *To my most dearely-loued friend Henery Reynolds Esquire, of Poets and Poesie, in The Battaile of Agincourt, etc.*, London, 1627.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 830.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

W. Alexander, "because a friend to Drayton,"<sup>1</sup> had snubbed him in 1619.

Why Drayton permitted this attack to be printed with his poems must remain a troublesome question. It is hard to believe that he mistook the poem for serious praise; perhaps the bookseller, noting that Jonson was praised in *Of Poets and Poesie*, solicited the prefatory verses, and reading them less critically than we do, slipped them into the volume.<sup>2</sup> The next edition also carried them, but since that edition appeared during the year of Drayton's death (1631) we are hardly in a position even to guess whether by his consent.

For some years Jonson was supposed to have written Drayton's epitaph in Westminster Abbey, but as Mr. B. H. Newdigate writes: "Jonson's authorship of these lines is doubtful. 'Tradition hath generally fixed on Jonson as the author of this epitaph' (Whalley). But in the Bodleian MS. Ashm. 38, it is subscribed 'T. Randall' (Randolph); and Aubrey ascribes it to Quarles."<sup>3</sup>

It will be noticed that I have made no attempt to identify the "greate Olcon" of the eighth *Eglog*, who also had deserted "the poor shepherd and his harmless sheep." This is because Olcon is not in the poem positively linked with Selena or Cerberon, hence cannot be made part of the present case.

<sup>1</sup> *Conversations*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, Oxford, 1925, I. 137. See also I. 136: "Drayton feared him, and he esteemed not of him," and I. 133: "his [Drayton's] Long Verses pleased him not."

<sup>2</sup> Study of the book, a small folio, proves that Jonson's poem was inserted after the volume had been planned and printed. The first gathering contains two sheets; the first leaf is the title-page; the next two leaves are signed A2 and A3. Between A2 and A3 a single sheet, signed "a," has been inserted. Jonson's poem is on this sheet.

<sup>3</sup> *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. B. H. Newdigate, p. 371.

## DR. JOHNSON'S LAW LECTURES FOR CHAMBERS, II

BY E. L. McADAM, JR.<sup>1</sup>

IN a recent article I presented evidence that Dr. Johnson collaborated with Sir Robert Chambers in writing that part of the Vinerian Lectures on English Law later published as *A Treatise on Estates and Tenures*.<sup>2</sup> I am now able to add further evidence and to present a syllabus of the lectures themselves, as preserved in Kings MSS. 80-97 in the British Museum.

Chambers was elected Vinerian Professor at Oxford<sup>3</sup> on May 7, 1766, having been Vinerian Fellow since January 1762,<sup>4</sup> and on December 27, 1766, *Jackson's Oxford Journal* announced that he had been admitted Principal of New Inn Hall. Meanwhile Johnson had spent the end of October and the first week of November in Oxford,<sup>5</sup> no doubt the beginning of the collaboration.<sup>6</sup> According

<sup>1</sup> Owing to the delays in transatlantic mails it has been impossible to submit proofs to Mr. McAdam. Dr. L. F. Powell has kindly read the proofs and checked the references.—Ed. R.E.S.

<sup>2</sup> *Review of English Studies*, October 1939, pp. 385-91. Copies of the *Treatise* may be consulted in the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Library of Congress and the Library of the New York Bar Association.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Viner (1678-1756), author of *A General Abridgment of Law and Equity*, Aldershot, 1742-57, 23 v., the unsold copies of which he bequeathed to the University of Oxford for the establishment of a Professorship of the Common Law.

<sup>4</sup> *Jackson's Oxford Journal*, May 10, 1766, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, January 1766, p. 46. The obituary of Chambers in the *Gentleman's Magazine* is in error in stating that Chambers was appointed to the professorship in 1762. Lady Chambers repeated the error from thence in the Memoir prefixed to the *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS.* collected by her husband, 1838. Johnson's letter of June 1, 1758, indicates that Chambers applied for a Vinerian Scholarship which he no doubt obtained.

<sup>5</sup> *Isham Diary* (unpublished), November 8, 1766; *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, ii. 25.

<sup>6</sup> See Johnson's letter to Chambers, postmarked October 8 (*The R. B. Adam Library*, i. 28): "I do not design that it [his visit] shall be longer than may consist with our necessary operations. Let me therefore know immediately how soon it will be necessary for us to be together. If I cannot immediately go with you to Oxford, you must be content to stay a little while in London." See also his letter of December 11: "Come up and work, and I will try to help you. You asked me what amends you could make me. You shall always be my friend." *op. cit.* i. 30.

to the Vinerian Statute, dated July 3, 1758, the professor should be, at the time of his election, "at least a Master of Arts or bachelor of civil law, by Oxford University degree, who has completed ten years from the time of his matriculation, and is also an advocate in the law of England . . . who has numbered four years from his admission to the pleading of causes." The stipend was £200 a year, for which he was to deliver, on the first Monday of each academical term, a lecture in the vernacular on the Law of England, with a penalty of £20 for each failure to deliver such a lecture. Moreover, he was bound to deliver every year, beginning at the end of Trinity term, and in the vernacular, a complete course of lectures on the law of England consisting of sixty lectures at least, "the whole sixty to be delivered on different days in the course of the academical term"; no more than four to be given in each week. A public notice of at least one month was to precede the series, and an amercement for not lecturing was set at 40s. on each occasion.<sup>1</sup> Heavy fines were set for failure to lecture, and this in itself is enough to explain Johnson's anxiety that the lectures be composed as soon as possible. Johnson's letter of January 22, 1767, indicates that progress had been made, and on February 21 an announcement appeared in *Jackson's Oxford Journal* that the Vinerian lectures would begin on March 17. On April 9 Johnson returned from helping Chambers at Oxford, as he noted in his diary. It seems most likely that by this time the whole course of lectures had been written, but whether it consisted of as many as sixty lectures is doubtful. After this the lectures were delivered at least once a year. The next course began on February 20, 1768,<sup>2</sup> and as Johnson was in Oxford at least as early as February 29 and remained till April 30,<sup>3</sup> it is clear that he may have helped Chambers again.

The next course was announced in *Jackson's Oxford Journal* on December 10, 1768, and commenced on January 14. Again Johnson was in Oxford helping Chambers. His diary records, under December 1768: "I am now going to bed after two in the morning, being to rise by seven to go to Oxford." In Letter 211 to Mrs. Thrale, dated December 2, he says, "I can readily find no paper that is not ruled for juridical use," which indicates that he was staying as usual with Chambers in New Inn Hall, and in Letter 211.1

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford University Statutes*, tr. G. R. M. Ward, 1845, I. 300; v. also Blackstone's *Commentaries*, I. 28 n.

<sup>2</sup> Announced in *Jackson's Oxford Journal* of that date.

<sup>3</sup> Letters, Nos. 195.1-204; *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, iii. 453.

to Mrs. Thrale, dated December 14, he shows that he was assisting with the lectures.

Chambers has no heart, so I shall have the pleasure of seeing you on Saturday, and next week will be the end of the course [*i.e.*, we will have finished writing it]. If he had courage I think it might have been done by Wednesday.<sup>1</sup>

Johnson and Percy went to Oxford on 14 February 1769, chiefly to see Goldsmith, M.B. of Dublin, admitted *ad eundem gradum*. Percy recorded in his diary on the 15th that he 'heard Mr. Chambers's Lecture'; it is probable that Johnson and Goldsmith also attended. The party returned to London on the 18th.<sup>2</sup>

Johnson was again in Oxford in June, as Letters 216-8 show. He may have helped at this time with the fourth series, which was announced on September 30 and delivered on October 27 and thereafter.<sup>3</sup> I am not aware of any coincidence after this between Johnson's visits and the lectures, which were repeated on October 29, 1770. In 1771 they were announced for the same date, but on October 26 an announcement appeared postponing them "at the Desire of Several Gentlemen in the University" to January 14, 1772, when they were duly given. It is hardly likely that procrastination or self-distrust had again interfered, but the possibility must be mentioned.

Chambers began his seventh and last series on December 1, 1772. In the following spring he was appointed to the judgeship in Bengal, and in the summer he was given permission to appoint a deputy to deliver the lectures till he decided whether his absence was permanent. The lectures were announced in *Jackson's Oxford Journal* for September 25, 1773, but this was no doubt the deputy's announcement. Chambers had in August accompanied Johnson on his way to Scotland as far as Newcastle. I find no announcement for the winter of 1774-5; on October 21, 1775, an announcement appeared signed R. Wooddeson. Shortly after this Chambers resigned the professorship, which then went to Blackstone's son.

No attempt to publish the lectures during Chambers's life seems to have been made. Blackstone's *Commentaries* began to appear in 1765, the year before Chambers assumed the professorship, and were an immediate success, the magnitude of which no doubt dissuaded

<sup>1</sup> I owe the quotation to the courtesy of Prof. Dixon Wecter.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, i. 548.

<sup>3</sup> *Jackson's Oxford Journal*, September 30, October 21, 1769.

Chambers from publishing his own. In his will, quoted by Lady Chambers, he left to his wife

the copyright of my Lectures formerly read before the University of Oxford, and all my notebooks concerning the same, requesting however that she will not publish them without good advice. I have many other English manuscripts and notebooks of other kinds, some of which, about twelve in number, were bequeathed to me by my worthy friend . . . Mr. Justice Hyde . . . and the greatest part of the remainder, amounting to nearly sixty, were written by myself or transcribed by my servant. All these I give and bequeath to my said dear wife, to be destroyed or disposed of as she shall think proper.<sup>1</sup>

Lady Chambers adds,

His Majesty King George the Third, by an order through his librarian, desired to have a copy of these entire Lectures, which were presented in person, and the MSS. were placed in the Royal Library. . . . One other entire copy only exists, and together with various other MSS. is left by will to Lady Chambers.<sup>2</sup>

The copy is now in the British Museum ; the whereabouts of the other MSS. is not known.

The MS. is entitled *A Course of Lectures on the English Law*, and consists of fifty-six lectures in four series, forming eighteen volumes. Attached to the covers of vols. VIII–XVIII are copies of a contemporary printed syllabus of parts II, III of the lectures, perhaps distributed to the students. For convenience of reference I subjoin here the topics of the lectures, together with volume and folio references.

#### INTRODUCTION

- [Kings MS. 80,  
f. 2, lect. i.] Of the Law of Nature, the Revealed Law, and the Law of Nations, the primary Sources of the Law of England.
- [f. 42, ii.] Of the Origin of Feudal Government, and of the Anglo-Saxon Government and Laws.
- [f. 77, iii.] Of the Feudal Law strictly so called, and of the Effects of the Law on our Constitution & Government.
- [f. 119, iv.] On the General Division of the Laws of England.

#### PART I

- [Kings MS. 81,  
f. 2, i.] containing the Publick Law of England.
- [f. 33, ii.] Of the Origin and different Forms of *Parliament*.
- [f. 70, iii.] Of the present Constitution of *Parliaments*.
- [f. 94, iv.] Of the King and first of his Coronation Oath.
- [f. 94, iv.] Of the King's Prerogative and first of his Prerogative of Power and of Exemption.

<sup>1</sup> *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS.*, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

- [Kings MS. 82,  
f. 2, v.] Of the King's Prerogative of Possession or his antient and established Revenue.
- [f. 38, vi.] Of the Royal Family, and of the House of Lords.
- [f. 92, vii.] Of the House of Commons.
- [f. 132, vi.] Of the Royal Family. (a) In the first Transcript of these Lectures the 6th Lecture of the first Part is entitled *Of the Royal Family and House of Lords*. This Discourse consists of the former Part of *that* corrected and enlarged, the Disquisition on the House of Lords continues nearly as before and forms a distinct Lecture.
- [Kings MS. 83,  
f. 2, viii.] Of the Privy Council and Officers of State.
- [f. 45, ix.] Of Courts of Justice, and first of General Courts of Common Law and Equity.
- [Kings MS. 84,  
f. 2, x.] Of Courts whose Judgments are directed by the Civil, Canon, and Maritime Law ; and of Courts of private Jurisdiction.
- [f. 31, xi.] Of the Civil Division of England and of Territorial Magistrates.
- [f. 86, xii.] Of Civil Rank Order and Precedence.
- [Kings MS. 85,  
f. 2, xiii.] Of the Rights of Embassadours.
- [f. 40, xiv.] Of *Aliens*, and of the Incorporation of England with Wales and its Union with Scotland.
- [Kings MS. 86,  
f. 2, xv.] Of the Government of Ireland and the American Provinces.
- [f. 43, xvi.] Of Corporations.

## PART II

The Subjects of the Criminal Law of England are

- [Kings MS. 87,  
f. 2, i.] I. The general Nature of Punishment.
- [f. 36, ii.] II. The History of Punishment.
- [f. 88, iii.] III. Exemption from Punishment, wherein
- [Kings MS. 88,  
f. 2, iv.] 1. Of Incapacity to commit Crimes
- [f. 36, v.] 2. Of Benefit of Clergy.
- [f. 85, vi.] IV. Offences against the Government, which are
- [f. 117, vii.] 1. High-Treason, whether
- { 1. Against the Statute of Edw. III. or
- { 2. Against subsequent Statutes.
2. Felonies immediately against the Crown.
3. Offences against the Crown inferior to Felony, which are
- { 1. Præmunire.
- { 2. Misprision of Treason.
- { 3. Simple Misprision or Contempt.



[Kings MS. 89,  
f. 1, viii.]

[f. 32, ix.]  
[f. 55, x.]

[f. 83, xi.]  
[Kings MS. 90,  
f. 1, xii.]

[f. 20, xiii.]

[f. 43, xiv.]

V. Offences against the general Duties of Citizens, which are

1. Against the Subjects of other States.

2. Against Fellow Subjects, being

- { 1. Against their Persons, viz.
  - { 1. Homicide.
  - { 2. Acts of Injurious Violence.

2. Against their Property, viz.

- { 1. Arson, or House-burning.
- { 2. Burglary, or House-breaking.
- { 3. Malicious Mischief.
- { 4. Forgery.
- { 5. Larceny.

3. Against the Commonwealth, which are

- { 1. Against the established Religion.
- { 2. Against Publick Justice.
- { 3. Against Publick Tranquillity.
- { 4. Against Publick Order.

VI. The different Imputation of Crimes to Agents and Accomplices.

PART III

The Subjects of the Private Law of England are

[Kings MS. 91,  
f. 1, i.]

[f. 50, ii.]

[f. 111, iii.]

[Kings MS. 92,  
f. 1, iv.]  
[f. 38, v.]

[f. 88, vi.]

I. The Personal Rights of Men and the Injuries affecting them

- 1. Absolutely as Individuals.
- 2. In Economical Relations.
- 3. In private civil Relations.

II. <sup>1</sup> *The several Species of Real Estates which are*

1. *A Freehold,*

- { 1. *Of Inheritance being either*
  - { 1. *Fee-Simple, or*
  - { 2. *Fee-Tail.*

2. *A mere Freehold which is*

- 1. *After Possibility of Issue extinct.*
- 2. *By Courtesy.*
- 3. *By Dower.*
- 4. *For Life.*

2. *A Chattel Real which is*

- { 1. *A Lease for Years.*
- { 2. *A Tenancy at will.*

<sup>1</sup> The Lectures on the several Species of Real Estates are a comment on the first Book of *Littleton's Tenures*.

[Kings MS. 93,  
f. 1, vii.]

3. *A Customary Estate*
  1. *By Copy of Court Roll.*
  2. *By the Verge.*

[f. 44, viii.]

- III. The Conditions annexed to Real Estates ; wherein of
  1. The Tenures by which they are holden and the Conditions therein implied.
  2. Estates upon Condition strictly so called.

[f. 89, ix.]

[Kings MS. 94,  
f. 1, x.]

- IV. The Joint Possession of Estates by
  1. Parceners.
  2. Joint Tenants.
  3. Tenants in Common.

[f. 23, xi.]

- V. Purchase, or the Acquisition of Real Property without Inheritance, which might be
  1. Original Acquisition, viz. Occupancy.
  2. Derivative, being
    1. Prescription.
    2. Forfeiture.
    3. Escheat.
    4. Bankruptcy.
    5. Alienation by common Assurance.

[f. 52, xii.]

[Kings MS. 95,  
f. 1, xiii.]

- VI. Injuries affecting Real Property, and their respective Remedies ; whether
  1. Not amounting to Dispossession, or
  2. Such as dispossess the Proprietor.

[f. 32, xiv.]

[f. 72, xv.]

- VII. The several Species of Chattels, or Personal Property.
- VIII. The Means of acquiring Personal Property which are
  1. Original, viz.
    1. Occupancy.
    2. Invention.
  2. Derivative, whether
    1. Without the Consent of the former Owner, or
    2. With his Consent.

[Kings MS. 96,  
f. 1, xvi.]

[f. 36, xvii.]

[f. 67, xviii.]

- IX. Injuries affecting Personal Property and their respective Remedies.

[Kings MS. 97,  
f. 1, xix.]

[f. 29, xx.]

[f. 53, xxi.]

- X. Private Rights as protected by Courts of Equity
  1. In Cases of Securities for Money lent.
  2. In Cases of Contract.
  3. In Cases of Fiduciary Property.

[Kings MS. 97,  
[f. 84, xxii.]

4. In cases where legal Evidence or legal Trial would be insufficient.
5. In Cases where there is no legal Remedy, or where a legal Remedy would be either dilatory or inadequate.

The conclusion at the end of Lecture xxii is entitled "On the Study of the Laws of England."

There is no reason to think that more lectures ever existed, especially when we consider the significance of the fact that one lecture is given in two forms, original and revised. There is nothing in the Vinerian Statute providing that the annual lectures differ from year to year, although that was certainly the intention of the University, since the Vinerian Scholars were required to attend "two series of lectures in English Law." It may well be that not all of the lectures were composed during the first year, since there seems to have been no attempt on the part of the University to ensure that the statutory number of sixty lectures was given. Johnson's aid therefore may have extended beyond the first year in both the original composition and revision. It is also possible that some of the lectures were first delivered from notes, though this seems most unlikely in view of Chambers's apparent timidity.

The first lecture begins with two paragraphs whose Johnsonian tone is quite unmistakable :

If I commence with Diffidence and Timidity the Employment to which I am now advanced, it is not merely because I consider the Law, which I am to profess, as by it's Extent difficult to be comprehended or by it's Variety difficult to be methodized ; for Obstacles like these must be encounter'd in all Studies, must be encounter'd with Vigour and surmounted by Diligence.

My fears proceed from Discouragements peculiar to myself. Professors like Princes are exposed to Censure not only by their own Defects, but by the Virtues of their Predecessors. I am to read and explain the Laws of England, from a Place just vacated, by a Man equally eminent for extent of Knowledge and Elegance of Diction, for Strength of Comprehension and Clearness of Explanation. That by the Choice of this learned University I am called into his Office, as it depresses my Hopes, must excite my Diligence. Abilities no Man has the Power of conferring on himself, but Fidelity and Industry are always attainable. I hope to erect such a Fabrick of Juridical Knowledge as may stand firm by it's Solidity, though it should not please by it's Elegance and shall think it sufficient

to mould those Materials into Strength, which only the Genius of a Blackstone could polish into Lustre.<sup>1</sup>

Lectures iii-x, xiv, and xix-xxi of Part III correspond with the *Treatise on Estates and Tenures*, but there are so many differences in detail that it is obvious that the manuscript used by Sir C. H. Chambers, no doubt the only "other entire copy" in the possession of Lady Chambers, was another recension, whether earlier or later admits of some doubt. On external evidence I should suspect it to be earlier, since the copy for the King's Library was probably made in the winter of 1773-4, after Chambers had ceased to lecture, but before he left for India. The copy contains virtually no footnotes; all citations are included in the text, as one would expect in lectures. The *Treatise* as published, however, relegated citations and what I take to be extended portions of the text itself to footnotes. Unless Chambers had himself done this with a view to eventual publication, it was done by his nephew. Changes in the text itself, on the other hand, may well have been made while preparing the copy for the King, even though the copy is not in Chambers's hand.

The nature of the changes in the text will be clear from the following paragraph, which corresponds to the second printed in my previous article :

We that see the World in motion by the Power of artificial Riches, and receive all that the Bountys<sup>2</sup> of Nature can give, or the Diligence of Art can fabricate, in Exchange for Gold and Silver; that devour at every Meal the Product of every Quarter of the Globe, and enjoy in every humble Habitations [*sic*] the Labour of a thousand Artificers; cannot easily conceive a State in which almost every Man was sufficient for himself, in which Families, then called splendid and opulent, provided in the House almost every thing that Life was then supposed to require. Yet this was undoubtedly the State of the first Feudal Communities; of which the Traces still remain in some Parts of the World. What then must have been the Condition of the unhappy Man that had no Land? We all live upon the Fruits of the Earth and every Man therefore must buy or raise them. To buy could be in the power of few, where there were so few wants and so little Money. To raise them was impossible to him that had no Land, unless he might be permitted to cultivate the Land of another, and this Permission he must purchase on any Terms which the Lord or Tyrant of the District as he was more or less benevolent should happen to prescribe [.] If it be objected that the Land is of no use to the owner but as it is tilled and that therefore he would willingly feed all that

<sup>1</sup> Kings MS. 8o, ff. 2-4.

<sup>2</sup> The *s* appears to have been lightly erased.

would labour, it must be remembered that while Men are satisfied with the Products of the Earth very little improved by Art or Manufacture, many will be sustained by the Labour of a few, a single shepherd can tend a numerous Flock, a few Plows will till a spacious Farm; and as there was then no commerce by which superfluities might be turned to Profit, the Lord could desire to raise no more than he consumed. Thus Land was more necessary to the Labourer than the Labourer to the Land. Many petitioned to be fed whose Work was not wanted by him that fed them. They were therefore reduced to the hard Choice of Servitude or Hunger and accepted small portions of Land on the cruel Terms of becoming in some Sense the Cattle of their Lord, a Property appendant to the Soil by which they were sustained. This is the *natural* and therefore probably the *true* Original of Villenage, & such with accidental Differences of Mode will be inevitably the State of every Nation where Lands are appropriated, and Arts are few. One Part must live wholly at the Mercy of the other, and where there is no Reciprocation of Benefits the Conditions of Life will always be unequal.<sup>1</sup>

The last, particularly Johnsonian, sentence was omitted from the printed version. In some ways the printed version is more compact, from the omission of inessential words, phrases, and sentences, so that it is no doubt possible that it represents a later revision than the copy for the King's Library. That this was the case is suggested by the remark in Sir Charles's preface to the *Treatise*, that had his uncle's health permitted he intended to write a commentary on the common law. I am aware that the tentative nature of these conclusions is unfortunate, but since the manuscripts in the British Museum are not at present available to me for consultation, it seemed advisable to give the results so far obtained,<sup>2</sup> as well as to give a syllabus indicating the contents of the lectures.

<sup>1</sup> Kings MS. 93, ff. 17-21.

<sup>2</sup> I have recently found in the library of Columbia University a hitherto unnoted folio pamphlet by Chambers which is interesting since it was published in his lifetime, and is the longest work of his sole composition. The style bears no resemblance to that of Dr. Johnson. The title-page has no imprint; it reads: *Copy of a Letter from Sir Robert Chambers to the Governour General and Council: containing an account of the former government of Chinsura under the Dutch, and of Chandernagur under the French, with his proposals respecting the future administration of justice and police in those settlements.* The letter is signed, and dated Fort William, August 3, 1781.

## THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE MOTTOES AND QUOTATIONS IN THE *RAMBLER*

BY ELLEN DOUGLASS LEYBURN

WHEN the *Rambler* began to appear in 1750, it at once<sup>1</sup> evoked the comparison with the *Spectator* which has become almost a convention among commentators. One particular in which Johnson's paper resembled its predecessor was that of opening each number with an appropriate quotation in Latin or Greek. In the form in which the essays of the *Rambler* are commonly known, these mottoes and most of the Greek and Latin quotations included in the papers are accompanied by English translations from various hands. But the original issues did not have this improvement over the earlier paper; and the credit for the addition does not belong to Johnson himself. The idea was conceived and first executed by James Elphinston, a schoolmaster of Scottish extraction whom Johnson befriended. Hence the history of the translations in the *Rambler* throws light on the relative time of early editions and makes clear Johnson's conception of what liberties he might properly take in using the work of other men.

Boswell gives the following account of the first appearance of the translations :

Mr. James Elphinston, who has since published various works, and who was ever esteemed by Johnson as a worthy man, happened to be in Scotland while the *Rambler* was coming out in single papers at London. With a laudable zeal at once for the improvement of his countrymen and the reputation of his friend, he suggested and took the charge of an edition of those Essays at Edinburgh, which followed progressively the London publication. . . . It was executed in the printing office of Sands, Murray, and Cochran, with uncommon elegance, upon writing paper of a duodecimo size, and with the greatest correctness; and Mr. Elphinston enriched it with translations of the mottos. When completed, it made eight handsome volumes. It is, unquestionably, the most accurate and

<sup>1</sup> See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, xx. 465 (October, 1750).

beautiful edition of this work ; and there being but a small impression, it is now become scarce, and sells at a very high price.<sup>1</sup>

Boswell's own " laudable zeal " rather carries him away in praise of the elegance of this production of his countrymen ; but in supplying translations, and still more in supplying to Johnson the idea of using translations, Elphinston did really enrich the *Rambler*. Furthermore, these translations and the ones Johnson substituted for most of them show the relation in time of the first Edinburgh edition and the first collected London edition.

In January of 1752, while the paper was still appearing in bi-weekly issues, Johnson published four volumes, including the first 136 numbers, in a collected edition in duodecimo to supplement the folio edition made up of the original sheets.<sup>2</sup> These still had no translations of the mottoes. Later in the year, after the periodical issues had stopped, the remaining numbers were published in two more volumes of the collected London edition ; and at the end of volume VI were bound the tables of contents for each of the six volumes and translations of the mottoes, as announced in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for July 1752.<sup>3</sup> Thirty-six of these translations are taken from the Edinburgh edition ; but Johnson stopped his borrowings from Elphinston with number 157. The reason for this is that Elphinston stopped making his own translations and began to borrow from Johnson. In his *Forty Years' Correspondence between Geniusses ov boath Sexes and James Elphinston*, a work published by the quixotic Scotchman in 1791-4, and made ludicrous by the transliteration of all the letters from his friends into the strange phonetic spelling he was trying to establish, he explains in a footnote to Johnson's letter concerning the mottoes that

he translated not anoddher motto, after he understood dhat dhe Author had sold dhe property ; dho he continued to' dhe last hiz care ov dhe Scotch Ediscion.<sup>4</sup>

Volume VI, the last volume of the first Edinburgh edition to appear in 1751, still has entirely Elphinston's translations. But volumes VII

<sup>1</sup> *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill and L. F. Powell, Oxford, 1934, I. 210 and 210, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> For peculiarities of the folio edition, see W. P. Courtney, *A Bibliography of Samuel Johnson*, Oxford, 1915, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> XXII. 338.

<sup>4</sup> *Forty Years' Correspondence between Geniusses ov boath Sexes and James Elphinston : in six pocket-volumes ; foar' ov oridiginal Letters, two' ov Poetry*, London, 1791-4, I. 34-5 and note.



and VIII, dated 1752, follow the translations Johnson gives in volume VI of his collected London edition. Thus, while the Edinburgh edition began a year and a half before the London edition in duodecimo, it was not completed until after the publication of the final London volumes. Since the *Scots Magazine* shows that the last two volumes of Elphinston's edition appeared in July 1752,<sup>1</sup> it must have been completed very soon after the London edition.

More important than their bearing on the chronology of early editions of the *Rambler* is the demonstration the translations afford of Johnson's principles of honesty in quoting from poets both more and less gifted than he. Elphinston's pompous dullness as a poet explains the reason for there being translations from a composite group of writers instead of a complete reproduction of his own. Although Johnson did this worthy man many offices of friendship in connection with his school at Brompton, even advertising it in a note to the fourth and several subsequent editions of the *Rambler*, he had to admit: "I would not put a boy to him, whom I intended for a man of learning."<sup>2</sup> Elphinston plumed himself on his virtuosity as a translator in verse and fed his pride upon Johnson's praise of his renderings of the mottoes of the *Rambler*. He was especially fond of translating the "Sentencious Poets" into "correspondent English Mezzure," though his talent for turning epigrams may be judged by such specimens as:

In genrous brest no rancor lies :  
Anguer, dho just, just gleams and dies.

In cases crittical we find,  
Dhat spirrit much avails mankind.

When sorrow reaches highest tide,  
She cannot rize ; but must subside.<sup>3</sup>

Nobel Ollus constructed dhe poor a retreat ;  
Dho hiz lands all he sold, he pozesses a seat.<sup>4</sup>

It is small wonder that Garrick doubted his seriousness in intending to produce his *Martial* and that his brother-in-law, Strahan, vainly offered him a bribe to refrain from publishing.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, acquaintance with the later translations of Elphinston makes it surprising that Johnson could use any of his work for the *Rambler*. But actually,

<sup>1</sup> xiv. 368.

<sup>2</sup> Boswell's *Life*, II. 171.

<sup>3</sup> James Elphinston, *Dhe Sentencious Poets : Arrainged, and translated into, correspondent English Mezzure*, London, 1794, pp. 11, 15, and 39.

<sup>4</sup> *Epigrams ov Marsial variously turned from Forty Years' Correspondence*, v. 246.

<sup>5</sup> Boswell's *Life*, III. 258-9.

while his renderings of the mottoes are not high poetry, their level is nothing like so ridiculously low as that of his other translations. It is easy to understand that both his friendship for Elphinston and his own inertia induced Johnson to retain thirty-six translations from the Edinburgh edition. However, since Elphinston was not a great poet, it is fortunate that he was poor enough to be considered in most instances entirely inadequate; for this compelled Johnson to look elsewhere for renderings of his quotations from Greek and Latin. He drew upon twenty-one different sources; and the results are in most cases distinguished.

Furthermore, Johnson's manipulation of the wordings which he did take from Elphinston furnish an impressive example of his willingness to revise the work of his friends and let the revisions pass as the work of the inadequate writer. He discarded Elphinston's translation of the general motto without making any substitution for it; and this motto was thereafter printed without translation. But Johnson began to depend on the Edinburgh edition with the motto of the first paper, beginning his revisions at the same time. Hardly more than two-thirds of the translations he takes from Elphinston are reproduced without change in wording. In number 1 "If leisure let" appears in the London edition "If time permit." In number 3 "Giddy critics" is changed to "Giddy rabbles." In number 31 "Immoral manners" becomes "Corrupted manners." In number 37 "When at his call th' attendant flocks obey'd" is turned into "When list'ning flocks the powerful call obey'd." In number 73 there is a transposition in the order of ideas as well as a change in wording. In number 102 "In running life, as in the rolling tide" becomes in the London edition "Behold in running life the rolling tide." Half of the translation for number 119 is omitted, to its decided improvement. In number 121 "Avaunt," a word characteristic of Elphinston's inflated style, becomes "Away." In number 130 only two of the eight lines are kept unchanged. These liberties are all taken with translations ascribed entirely to the Edinburgh edition. But the strangest garbling occurs in number 32. Johnson here discards Elphinston's fourth line entirely, and the ascription "Edin. Ed." is printed after the third line; but in reality Johnson used only two lines from the Edinburgh edition, changing line 3 from "O never bear it with indignant mind" to "Ease it as thou can'st." The translation for number 45, which comes from the Edinburgh edition, is printed anonymously; so, if Johnson

improved Elphinston's credit in remodelling many of the translations ascribed to him, he failed in this instance to give him the credit due.

This failure gives rise to the question whether all the other mottoes printed anonymously may rightly be ascribed to Johnson himself. *The Gentleman's Magazine* for October 1752<sup>1</sup> attributes to him the translations of the quotations in numbers 48 and 54 and of the mottoes of numbers 33, 39, 45, 46, 53, 57, and 7 and 9, the last two being added for their excellence although Elphinston's translations through number 30 had appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine* of September 1750.<sup>2</sup> The magnificent lines with which the motto from Boethius for number 7 are rendered into English are almost certainly by Johnson, for Boswell calls them his without question.<sup>3</sup> To contrast them with the mixture of bombast and flatness in Elphinston's translation of the same quotation is to have the best quick demonstration of how much Johnson bettered the suggestion he received from his friend of publishing translations of the mottoes. Most of the other anonymous translations make striking improvements over those in the Edinburgh edition; especially is this true where two or more of Elphinston's lines are changed to one of sharper meaning. The trenchant quality of many of these shorter, unascribed translations makes us feel confident that they are by Johnson himself, though his carelessness in citing his sources makes it impossible to attribute them to him with certainty. For instance, the long translation for the motto from Juvenal for number 185, which Johnson ascribes to Dryden, is really by Creech, who did the Thirteenth Satire for Dryden's Juvenal; yet the lines are quoted exactly, and other translations from the same satire are correctly ascribed to Creech.

Indeed, the striking thing about Johnson's use of the translations which he does take from Dryden and Pope is the scrupulous exactness with which he quotes them. There are thirty-one from Dryden; and in all these there are only two changes of wording. In number 179 "would" is substituted for "could"; and in number 187 the line "Or Italy's indulgent heaven forego" is changed to "Or the mild bliss of temperate skies forego." This change, the only one of any consequence, is made, I think, because of the obvious incongruity of Italy with the Iceland tale of Ajut and Anningait. Of the fifteen quotations from Pope, all are exact except that in number 36, in order to give the quotation a subject, Johnson has to put in the

<sup>1</sup> XXII. 468-70.

<sup>2</sup> XX. 406-9.

<sup>3</sup> *Boswell's Life*, I. 139.

word "shepherds" from Pope's preceding line, and in the one in number 94 he substitutes "impetuous arrow" for "impatient weapon." Evidently Johnson had entirely different standards of scholarly accuracy in quoting the lines of great poets and in bettering those of a well-meaning but inept friend. Plagiarism from oneself for the benefit of another he thought no wrong, as his well-known remodellings of the works of Miss Anna Williams prove. That he had at least some respect for his Scotch friend's integrity as a writer is shown by his not revising the translations out of all recognition, as he did some of the compositions of that estimable lady. Certainly Elphinston regarded it as no indignity to have his work done over by so great a master.

Other translations not from published works like Dryden's *Virgil* and Pope's *Homer* seem to have been made by various friends of Johnson, as were Elphinston's, directly for the quotations used in the *Rambler*. Many were furnished by Francis (probably Philip Francis, an Irish churchman, father of the Philip Francis of whom Johnson thought very highly as a translator of Horace) and by F. Lewis, whom *The Gentleman's Magazine* calls "the Rev. Francis Lewis of Chiswick."<sup>1</sup> What use was made of their translations will probably never be known, as there is little hope of recovering them in the form in which they were given to Johnson. The degree of his accuracy in quoting them would, of course, have more significant bearing on his manipulations of Elphinston's work than does his exactness in using lines from famous writers like Pope and Dryden.

After all, his revision of the Edinburgh translations, which he had before him, is not so surprising as his care to quote the better known lines correctly, which must at least in some cases have meant looking them up instead of trusting to memory, as we should expect him to do. But his independence asserted itself in the matter of choosing the sources from which to better Elphinston's translations. Great as were the names of Pope and Dryden, Johnson never felt constrained to use their translations for his mottoes unless it suited him to do so. There are numerous translations for Virgil, Juvenal, Ovid, and Homer not taken from the available works of his two favourites. The substitutes are from various writers, though most of those for Juvenal are by Johnson himself, or at least are printed anonymously.

As the translations now appear, they form a really stirring and

<sup>1</sup> XXII. 468 (October 1752).

noble collection of English verse. If Boswell was extravagant in saying that Elphinston enriched the papers with translations of the mottoes, at least the credit must go to a Scotsman for furnishing Johnson with the idea for what became in his hands a true enrichment of the *Rambler*.

# APPENDIX

## SOURCES OF TRANSLATIONS BY DRYDEN USED IN THE *Rambler*

(Exactly quoted with exceptions noted)

1. Motto for no. 15. First Satire of Juvenal, ll. 133-5.
2. Motto for no. 16. Tenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 12-13.
3. Quotation in no. 16. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book VI, ll. 192-3.
4. Motto for no. 20. Third Satire of Persius, ll. 53-6.
5. Motto for no. 24. Fourth Satire of Persius, l. 46.
6. Motto for no. 25. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book V, l. 300.
7. Motto for no. 29. Twenty-ninth Ode of First Book of Horace, st. VI, ll. 6-10.
8. Quotation in no. 37. Pastoral VIII of Virgil, ll. 60-2.
9. Quotation in no. 41. Twenty-ninth Ode of First Book of Horace, st. VII, ll. 5-8.
10. Quotation in no. 59. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book I, l. 292.
11. Motto for no. 66. Tenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 1-3.
12. Motto for no. 70. Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book I, ll. 146-7.
13. Motto for no. 78. Tenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 279-80.
14. Motto for no. 80. Ninth Ode of First Book of Horace, ll. 1-4.
15. Quotation in no. 87. Virgil's *Georgics*, Book III, ll. 13-14.
16. Quotation in no. 94. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book I, ll. 824-9.
17. Another in no. 94. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book II, ll. 328-9.
18. Another in no. 94. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book V, ll. 640-1.
19. Motto for no. 100. First Satire of Persius, ll. 233-8. ("Horace" taken from l. 232.)
20. Motto for no. 103. Third Satire of Juvenal, ll. 194-5.
21. Motto for no. 113. Sixth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 40-1.
22. Motto for no. 114. Sixth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 310-11.
23. Motto for no. 115. Sixth Satire of Juvenal, l. 264.
24. Quotation in no. 117. Second Book of Lucretius, ll. 7-11, exactly quoted from second word on, Dryden's "But much more" omitted.
25. Quotation in no. 143. Virgil's *Aeneis*, Book VI, ll. 1176-7.
26. Motto for no. 144. Pastoral III of Virgil, ll. 18-20.
27. Motto for no. 154. Virgil's *Georgics*, Book II, ll. 243-5.
28. Motto for no. 169. First Satire of Persius, ll. 209-10.

29. Motto for no. 179. Tenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 47-8, exactly quoted except that "would" is substituted for "could."  
 30. Motto for no. 184. Tenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 536-8.  
 31. Motto for no. 187. Pastoral X of Virgil, ll. 92-5 and l. 99, exactly quoted except l. 94, which is revised as explained in the text.

The motto for no. 185, which is incorrectly ascribed to Dryden and has hitherto been counted to make up the thirty-two attributed to him, is really by Creech and comes from the Thirteenth Satire of Juvenal, ll. 231-3, 236-44, exactly quoted.

#### SOURCES OF TRANSLATIONS BY POPE USED IN THE *Rambler*

(Exactly quoted with exceptions noted)

1. Motto for no. 2. *Windsor Forest*, ll. 151-4.
2. Motto for no. 36. *Iliad*, Book XVIII, ll. 609-10,<sup>1</sup> exactly quoted except that "shepherds" is taken from l. 608 and "behind" is omitted to make the added word fit the meter.
3. Motto for no. 44. *Iliad*, Book I, l. 86.
4. Quotation in no. 83. *Odyssey*, Book IX, ll. 107-10.
5. Quotation in no. 92. *Odyssey*, Book IX, ll. 493-4.
6. Another in no. 92. *Iliad*, Book XXI, ll. 306-11.
7. Another in no. 92. *Odyssey*, Book IX, ll. 342-5.
8. Another in no. 92. *Iliad*, Book XI, ll. 47-8.
9. Quotation in no. 94. *Iliad*, Book XVIII, ll. 569-74.
10. Another in no. 94. *Iliad*, Book IV, l. 156, "impatient weapon" changed to "impetuous arrow."
11. Motto for no. 117. *Odyssey*, Book XI, ll. 386-8.
12. Motto for no. 136. *Iliad*, Book IX, ll. 412-13.
13. Motto for no. 142. *Odyssey*, Book IX, ll. 217-22.
14. Quotation in no. 158. *Odyssey*, Book I, ll. 1-14.
15. Motto for no. 190. *First Epistle of Second Book of Horace*, ll. 14-15, exactly quoted, names from ll. 7 and 8.

<sup>1</sup> Numbering of lines seems to vary in modern editions of Pope's *Homer*. The numbers here given are those of the original editions.



## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### ROCHESTER, DRYDEN, AND THE DUCHESS OF PORTSMOUTH

MR. J. HAROLD WILSON in his article entitled "Rochester, Dryden, and the Rose-Street Affair" seems to me to have made out an excellent case for supposing that the "Black Will" letter written by Rochester to Henry Savile (no. XVI in Hayward's edition of Rochester) should be dated not, as most critics have supposed, in the winter of 1679 but somewhere about 1675-1676, and that it is connected with Rochester's poem *An Allusion to Horace*. He has thus demolished the most damning piece of evidence cited to prove that Rochester was guilty of instigating the notorious "Rose Alley ambuscade" of December 18, 1679. I was always doubtful about Rochester's alleged connection with the affair. In my *Rochester, Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, I wrote (p. 203): "in fairness to Rochester, however, it must be admitted that the words in his letter [*i.e.* the "Black Will" letter] are very obscure," and "such an action as the cudgelling of Dryden was far more in keeping with the character of a vindictive and treacherous woman [*i.e.* the Duchess of Portsmouth] than with that of Rochester, whose faults were not those of an ill-natured man." In fairness to *me*, Mr. Wilson (while quite rightly pointing out that I had misread Rochester's letter to Savile dated November 21, 1679) might have referred to these passages to show that I had strong suspicions that Rochester was not the culprit.

I believe that the real instigator of the outrage was the Duchess of Portsmouth. In spite of his mistakes Anthony à Wood was a shrewd observer, and the fact that he connects the Duchess with the affair in his *Life of Buckingham* is not to be dismissed so lightly as Mr. Wilson imagines, especially in view of the fact that his statement (as far as it relates to Portsmouth) is corroborated by Luttrell in a passage that Mr. Wilson seems to have overlooked:

About the same time Mr. John Dryden was sett on in Covent Garden in the evening by three fellowes, who beat him very severely, and on peoples



coming in they run away: 'tis thought to be done by order of the dutchesse of Portsmouth, she being abused in a late libell called an Essay upon satyr, of which Mr. Dryden is suspected to be the author (Luttrell, I. 30).

Mr. Wilson's statement that in *An Essay upon Satyr* Portsmouth was "barely referred to in passing (not by name) as one of the 'beastly brace'" is rather misleading. The author of *An Essay upon Satyr* certainly does not mention Portsmouth by name, but the passage in which he attacks her is far more than a "bare reference." It is one of the bitterest, most insulting, and also one of the most ably written passages in the whole poem:

Nor shall the royal mistresses be nam'd,  
Too ugly, or too easy to be blam'd;  
With whom each rhyming sot keeps such a pother,  
They are as common that way as the other:  
Yet sauntering Charles between his beastly brace  
Meets with dissembling still in either place,  
Affected humour, or a painted face.  
In loyal libels we have often told him,  
How one has jilted him, the other sold him:  
How that affects to laugh, how this to weep;  
But who can rail so long as he can sleep?  
Was ever prince by two at once misled,  
False, foolish, old, ill-natur'd, and ill-bred?

The fact that Dryden's cudgelling was due to the suspicion that he wrote *An Essay upon Satyr* was so well known that Dean Lockier informed Spence that it was commonly called "The Rose Alley satire." Rochester, as Mr. Wilson points out, was probably too good a critic to attribute it to Dryden, but Louise de Kéroualle is not likely to have been acquainted with the niceties of English poetic style, and it would be entirely in keeping with her character and with the manners of the contemporary French aristocracy if she revenged herself savagely on a man whom she believed to have described her in print as "False, foolish, old, ill-natur'd, and ill-bred."

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

#### "LIKE HIMSELF"

J. M. ROBERTSON in his attempt to prove that parts of *Henry V* are beneath Shakespeare pays some attention to the phrase *like himself*. He quotes the lines

Then should the warlike Henry, like himself,  
Assume the port of Mars (*Henry V*, I, Prol. 5).

He goes on to say : " that Shakespeare wrote the ' like himself ' in 1599 I am unable to believe ; that Peele did so years before is to me thinkable, though I suspect Marlowe." He adds a note : " the ' like Brutus, like himself ' in *Julius Cæsar* (v. iv. 24) suggests the same pre-Shakespearean hand ").<sup>1</sup>

Robertson's method is the superficial one of suggesting that since *like himself* is found in Peele and Marlowe, the passage from *Henry V* must be by one of these two dramatists. As a matter of fact it is not only in Peele and Marlowe, but also in Spenser and Ben Jonson. Indeed, it is common in the whole range of Elizabethan literature.

Robertson's treatment of the phrase led me to look round for other examples of it. I found that the shade of meaning intended by the Elizabethans has now gone out of use and we no longer appreciate the force of the words as they stand in *Henry V*. As *like* + a reflexive pronoun occurs so often in fine literature it may be worth while to make quite clear what the Elizabethans had in mind.

It first occurs in English, so far as I can trace it, as a translation of the Latin *sui similis*. Thus we have the following passages :

Therfore a manerly chylde shulde be lyke hym selfe no lesse in gamynge than at the table. [R. Whytinton *A lytel boke of good maners for chyl dren*, 1532, D2-D2\*. A translation of Erasmus's *De ciuitate morum puerilium*.] He coulde not be so lyke to his father as he was lyke vnto hymselfe [*non tam potuit patri similis esse, quam ille fuerat sui*]. (The same author's *The three boke of Tullyes offyces*, 1534, G7.)

From passages like this the phrase acquires the sense of " worthy of himself," or " in a manner worthy of himself." This is made quite clear by translations and by renderings in dictionaries. For instance, W. Walker gives us : You have done like your self. *Te dignum fecisti*. (*A treatise of English Particles*, 1686, ed. 9, p. 191). This neutral sense is fairly frequent, especially in the phrase " to live like himself," which Miegé translates as "*vivre selon sa Qualité, ou selon ses Reuenus* (*The Great French Dictionary*, 1687, s.v. *Like*).

But its most common use is in an intensive sense, both bad and good. It leaves us to infer that the person referred to is bad or good beyond the ordinary. It implies an especial contempt or a great admiration. The bad use is rare ; here are one or two instances :

His body was cast out, and buried in a dunghill ; for the papists would in all things be like themselves (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1839), VIII. 731).

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare Canon* (1922), p. 23.

Yet deale you like your selfe, and lay still the colours of probabilitie on sophistrie (Rainolds, *Th'overthrow of Stage Playes*, p. 61).

So lost, so wicked, nay, so like thy selfe (Jonson *Catiline*, l. 2, 192).

The last instance approaches the sense of "incomparable" which we find in the good use. It implies that Jonson cannot find anything bad enough for comparison except the person himself.

The favourable sense is extremely frequent when heroes, kings, and persons of exalted position are spoken of. *Like himself* here implies "like the great hero (king, etc.) that he is," "in a manner worthy of his great name or station":

euer like herself unstayned (Spenser *Fairy Queen*, II. ii. 9).

in terms like to himself,  
Like to the messenger of Scottish king,  
Defied the peers of England and their swords (Peele, *Edward I*, XIV. 23-4).  
King of Cilicia, kind and curtiuous,  
Like to thy selfe, because a louely King (Greene, *Looking Glasse*, IV. iii. 7).  
Oh then how proud a presence doth she beare.  
Then is she like her selfe fit to be seene,  
Of none but graue and consecrated eyes (Jonson, *Ev. Man in Humour*, v. i. 520).

Here is Mars, I thinke, not free from woes;  
And yet he beares them like himselfe (Chapman, *Iliad*, xv. (1895), p. 193).  
Bear my destruction gently and with a heart like yourself (1603, Raleigh, *Letter to his Wife*; see *Times Lit. Supplement*, Jan. 31, 1935, p. 53).  
'tis like yourselfe like Barnauelt, and in that, all is spoken (1619, *Trag. Sir John Van Olden Barnauelt*, ed. Frijlinck, I. i. 132).  
tis royall like himselfe (Beaumont and Fletcher, *Maids Trag.*, ed. 1630, B3).

Occasionally we get a similar phrase with *like* + noun, as

Cæsar hath done like Cæsar. Faire, and iust  
Is his award (Jonson, *Poet.* (ed. Simpson), v. iii. 135).  
Samson hath quit himself  
Like Samson (Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, l. 1, 710).

In the *Poetaster* the speaker is obviously intending to flatter Cæsar and to imply that Cæsar cannot be anything but fair and just. In all these cases the meaning is similar. A person is compared to himself in order to suggest that, being what he is, he will be especially fine or great or noble.

Moreover, there are one or two passages in which the phrase

goes beyond this meaning and approaches the sense of "incomparable."

O onely like thy self, the world always

Admireth thy great valour, grace and wit (Sir T. North, *Plutarch, Epaminondas* (ed. 1676), p. 917).

He (Sidney) onely like himselfe, was second vnto none (1593, *Phœnix Nest*, C2 (ed. Rollins), p. 19).

Blessed be this One unvariable . . . like himselfe (c. 1651, *Stanley Papers* (Chetham Soc. Vol. 70), p. 71).

While thou

Like consort to thy self canst no where find (Milton, *P. L.*, VIII. 448).

This latter sense finds many parallels in Elizabethan poetry :

Unto your selves, your selves, then we must say,

We onely may compare. (Heywood, *A marriage Triumphe on the Nuptials of the Prince Palatine* (ed. Percy Soc.) p. 12).

Lillies and Roses

Are figures fitting common beauties : hers

Wants a comparison but its proper selfe (1636, T. Nabbes, *Tottenham Crt.*, II. i. 14).

Is there a treachery, like this in Baseness . . .

None but Itself can be its Parallel. (*Double Falsehood*, III. i. (1728), p. 25).

*Like himself*, then, in the Prologue to *Henry V* means "worthy of such a great king and hero as Henry V was." There is also an implied meaning that no one else is like this warrior, that he is in fact incomparable or unique. It is a standing Elizabethan phrase, used especially with reference to men of heroic stature, elevated by that usage and therefore not beneath the dignity of great poetry.

HEREWARD T. PRICE.

### CONTEMPORARY PRAISE OF *POLYOLBION*

THE bibliography of Drayton's *Polyolbion* corroborates the other evidence that the *magnum opus* fell flat. Songs i-xviii were entered in the *S.R.* on February 7, 1612, and published without date. They were reissued in 1613. The rest, Songs xix-xxx, followed in 1622. The first part had not sold well enough to need reprinting, and was reissued to fit those copies of part ii which were not sold separately. The poem was about a generation too late to be a success. H. R. [Henry Reynolds] in 1630 [?] comments on Drayton's "ill

fate, in not hauing laid him out some happier Clime, to haue giuen honour and life to, in some happier language" (*Mythomystes*, p. 9). Any evidence, therefore, that the poem met with appreciation is interesting, and especially so when the evidence is that of a poet more up to date than Drayton in the poetic fashion.

The copy of *Polyolbion* (the complete work of 1622) which is in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge, has the initials "N. B." stamped on the inside of the cover, and its flyleaf bears an inscription of which everything except the date 1624 has been scored through. Under the scoring, however, it is possible to make out the words "Liber Johannis Blaidon."

No college records before 1629 have been published, but Venns' *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (1922, I. 162) records that Nathaniel Bladen was admitted to St. John's on May 6, 1661, *æt.* 18, and that he was the son of "John, deceased, of Hemsworth, Yorks."<sup>1</sup> It is John Bladen, then, whose MS. poem (signed "J B:") occupies the verso of the second leaf of the map which precedes Song xiii (*i.e.* opposite p. 213).<sup>2</sup> Bladen's poem has reference to ll. 39-234 of Song xiii (which is the best of the thirty) and reads as follows:<sup>3</sup>

An Elogye upon ye Author in this 13th Song.<sup>4</sup>

Ar't Mellanchollick? canst dispence  
With nature? & make fancy sence?  
Doe noates affect thy soules choyce eare?  
Wouldst thou hunt a Redd, or fallow Deare?  
Repayre to Ardens Chase. Next stage,  
Invites the to an Hermitage.

Be sure thou keep thy judgement fre,  
Least t' suffer, in the mellodye  
Of that harmonious ayry Quyre:  
(To Syrens not enferiour.)  
Here's one descants, another rests,  
A third holds noates: Noe vyoll-chests  
Yeilds better consorts. These can  
The Tennours, those ye base. The swan  
(Retyr'd) setts for her lachrimas;  
The Phillomell chants Roundeleys.

<sup>1</sup> Martin (1680-1746), the son of Nathaniel, admitted in 1697, is presumably the Bladen mentioned in the *Dunciad*, iv. 560 (see *D.N.B.*). One would suppose that the Bladens gave the book to St. John's, despite the scored-through eighteenth-century inscription opposite p. 194 of part ii: "Ry. [?] Sargent his Booke . . ."

<sup>2</sup> He has also made some notes up and down the volume, and drawn up a decorated genealogical table showing "The title of ye house of Yorke" in part ii (opposite p. 139).

<sup>3</sup> Thanks are due to the Council of St. John's College for permission to print the poem.

<sup>4</sup> It is impossible to be certain whether Bladen intends an initial *s* to be capital or small. The downward final *l* I have represented as "s." At l. 15 the "l" of "lachrimas" may have been intended for a capital.

Loose but thy fancy ; & then tell,  
 If Raptures can thy judgement swell.  
 Ayre it then a while, and but change  
 Thy subject (Fancie :) Take a range ;  
 Uncupple ye whole kenells ; And  
 Strike light thy Quarry (from yt stand.)  
 The Harts' on foot, the hill h' has climb'd ;  
 Noe sooner tapisht, but imprim'd : <sup>1</sup>  
 Hark how ye Ayre doth shake, w<sup>th</sup> noates  
 Of beagles, gibbetts, and ye throats  
 Of deep-mouth-hounds. Spurr up, & see  
 The Game at Bay, him fall, & Dye.  
 Least thou be loatht, yet leave him not  
 Till horne, & Voyce, have pay'd ye mott.<sup>2</sup>  
 Call in thy fancy, & noe more  
 Carrier ye playnes, & hills course o're :  
 Indulge it by that trilling brooke,  
 Yt Rock, yt grove, yt bank : but looke  
 How suddenly it fixed is ;  
 W<sup>th</sup> musing on an Hermits blisse ;  
 His independent life, his skill  
 In symples, his unchec'kt Will :  
 But 'bove ye world, he doth preferr,  
 That hee's his owne executer.  
 All this, our Poet hath enprest  
 To life ; w<sup>th</sup> fancies of ye best :  
 'Afore, the Muses wee might say,  
 But here, Appollo rul'd the day.

J B:

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

### TOBIAS SMOLLETT'S ASSAULT ON GORDON AND GROOM

FROM the vitriolic letter which Smollett wrote—but fortunately never sent—to Alexander Hume Campbell,<sup>3</sup> students of the eighteenth century have known that Smollett was found guilty in the Court of King's Bench of an assault, on November 2, 1752,<sup>4</sup> upon the person of Peter Gordon. Details leading up to and out of the brawl have been tantalizingly few ; fortunately one Chancery and two King's Bench suits which I have recently discovered enlarge our understanding of this stormy episode in Smollett's life.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Tapish" (a hunting term)=to lie hidden. Under "Imprime," *O.E.D.* quotes Turbervile, 1575 : "When he is hunted and doth first leave the herde we say that he is syngled or empyrmed."

<sup>2</sup> "Mot" is a hunting term for the note of a horn (*O.E.D.*). There is no reason to suppose Bladen meant to write "play'd."

<sup>3</sup> *The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M.D.*, ed. Edward S. Noyes (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1926), pp. 15-23.

<sup>4</sup> The date of the assault has not been known previously.

<sup>5</sup> King's Bench cases are generally unsatisfactory in that the documentation is slight. In this instance, however, we have not only Gordon's, but also Groom's suit for assault against Smollett, and also Smollett's Chancery suit against Groom.

The characters involved were Peter Gordon, an impecunious Scotsman, a hanger-on of Smollett's, Edward Groom (landlord to Peter Gordon), Groom's wife, David Greme, and Tobias Smollett himself. Most important of these after Smollett was Peter Gordon.

As early as March 1750 Tobias Smollett had been acquainted with Peter Gordon.<sup>1</sup> Through Smollett's "recommendation [Gordon had] been Employed in Writing part of the *Universal History*."<sup>2</sup> Smollett's patronage went even further, for on different occasions he lent Gordon "Several Sums of Money for his Support and maintenance the whole of which Amounts to the Sum of Two Hundred Pounds."<sup>3</sup>

Despite this generosity and despite an apparent income of £200<sup>4</sup> a year for his work on the *Universal History*, Peter Gordon remained in financial trouble, so much so that finally he :

Applied to Your Orator [Smollett] to lend him Money to discharge his said Debts at the same time assuring Your Orator that he then had a very particular and pressing Occasion for the Sum of Thirty pounds and that it would be of the utmost Ill Consequence to him should your orator refuse as he would be otherwise greatly obstructed in the Progress of the said work by the Continual Duns of his Creditors and by Actions at Law that would be brought against him<sup>5</sup>.

This request for help was probably made in February or March 1752. At any rate, Smollett, although customarily the most generous of men, was likewise in financial difficulties and was forced to tell Gordon "that he could not at that time Conveniently Advance him so much Money."<sup>6</sup> Gordon, however, not to be put off :

very much importuned you orator [Smollett] to Indorse for him one or more Promisory Notes which the said Peter Gordon proposed to Draw payable to your orator . . . and repeatedly and solemnly assured your orator that he would Secure your orator against any loss.<sup>7</sup>

Trusting the word of his friend, Smollett consented. Gordon, repeating his guarantee to Smollett against loss, on March 16,

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, C12 2230/10, Answer of Edward Groom, May 29, 1753. Further evidence of Smollett's acquaintance with Gordon is found in his letter to Dr. William Hunter, October 15, 1750 : "Peter Gordon shall wait on you tomorrow and receive your directions. . . ." (letter not in Noyes, but published by Thomas Bryce in *William Hunter and His Museum*, Glasgow, 1922). For this reference, and for other generous suggestions, I wish to thank Dr. Lewis M. Knapp.

<sup>2</sup> P. R. O., C12 2230/10, Bill of Tobias Smollett, "in the County of Middlesex Doctor in Physick."

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, "he might have Gained Two Hundred pounds a Year."

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*



1751-2 took out two notes of fifteen pounds each with the understanding that he would "deliver the same to your orator to be Cancelled."<sup>1</sup>

Peter Gordon was financially irresponsible. Unable six months later, September 16, 1752, to discharge the notes, he was forced a second time to apply for aid to Smollett. Assurances of good faith were of course not wanting: "he should Certainly be able to pay the Money in Two or Three months at the furthest . . . [and he] again protested that he should be entirely ruined in his credit unless he was Enabled to raise that Sum."<sup>2</sup> Smollett, "with a View to Serve the said Peter Gordon in his Distress,"<sup>3</sup> again complied; two notes with his indorsement were made by Gordon for terms of three months beginning September 16, 1752.

With the money thus secured Gordon paid the first two notes but failed in his promise to deliver them, cancelled, to his benefactor. And three months later, when Gordon failed to redeem his second pair of notes, Smollett was obliged to do so and accordingly "did with his own Monies pay the Same and Gave the said Peter Gordon notice thereof."<sup>4</sup>

A month or more passed, during which Smollett must have frequently requested Gordon to fulfil his promises, only to meet with rebuffs or evasions. In the letter to Campbell, Smollett describes Gordon's insolence.

after having received a thousand marks of my benevolence, and prevailed upon me to indorse notes for the support of his credit, he withdrew himself into the verge of the Court, and took up his habitation in a paltry alehouse, where he not only set me and the rest of his creditors at defiance, but provoked me, by scurrilous and indecent letters and messages, to chastise him. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Tobias Smollett was as proud as Lucifer, and such insults were not to be tolerated; he finally acted.

Tobias on the Second Day of November 1752 . . . with force and Arms that is to say with Swords Stave Stones Knives Clubbs fists Sticks and Whipps made an Assault upon him the said Peter at Westminster . . . and ill treated so that his life was Greatly despaired of and other Enormities to him then and there did against the peace of our said Lord.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, C12 2230/10, Bill of Tobias Smollett.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, p. 18.

<sup>6</sup> P. R. O., K. B. 122 255/fol. 626, Plea of Peter Gordon. Nicholas Coulston represented both Gordon and Groom; Richard Balshaw was counsel for Smollett.

Smollett later denied that he began the fight, charging that Gordon :

with force and Arms on him the said Tobias made an Assault and the said Tobias would have then and there immediately defended himself . . . that the Damages or Injuries if any happened to the said Peter was of the Assault of the said Peter and in the Defence of the said Tobias.<sup>1</sup>

The decision in favour of Gordon indicates, however, that Smollett must have started the assault. Smollett did not confine his attentions to Gordon. The documents show that Edward Groom, a Victualler of Westminster, and the landlord of Peter Gordon, was involved. Smollett attacked Groom and "then and there beat Wounded and ill treated Groom so that his life was greatly despaired of."<sup>2</sup> Smollett made the customary formal reply of not guilty to an assault on Groom as well as on Gordon, but the verdicts were against Smollett. The Court passed judgment that Smollett should pay Gordon twenty pounds ten shillings for damages and costs.<sup>3</sup> The "Verdict was obtained on the Evidence of this Defendant [Groom] and his said Wife who were present at the time of the said Assault."<sup>4</sup> Smollett later in his Chancery suit against Groom and Greme admitted that the testimony of the Grooms was largely responsible for the verdict against him, although earlier, in the heat of the Campbell letter, he had written that the case was lost on the evidence of a couple of drabs.<sup>5</sup> But whatever the reason for the decision in the Gordon suit, Smollett felt that he had been falsely charged, that "this terrible deliberate assassination was no more than a simple blow given to a rascal after repeated provocation, and that of the most flagrant kind."<sup>6</sup>

Edward Groom and his wife "recovered a Verdict against your Orator [Smollett] and [*sic*] Forty Shillings Damages besides Costs of Suit which said Costs have since been Taxed to Twenty pounds Ten Shillings."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. R. O., K. B. 122 255/fol. 626, Plea of Peter Gordon. Nicholas Coulston represented both Gordon and Groom; Richard Balshaw was counsel for Smollett.

<sup>2</sup> P. R. O., K. B. 122 225/fol. 627, Plea of Edward Groom.

<sup>3</sup> C12 2230/10, Bill of Tobias Smollett.

<sup>4</sup> C12 2230/10, Answer of Groom.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> *Letters*, p. 19.

<sup>7</sup> C12 2230/10, Bill of Tobias Smollett. Dr. Knapp has pointed out to me an obscure pamphlet by Andrew Henderson, *A Second Letter to Dr. Samuel Johnson . . . with an impartial character of Dr. Smollett*, London, n.d. 1775, in which is stated, "In 1753 he was found guilty of a cowardly assault upon an innocent man, Mr. Patrick Gordon, the real compiler of Rhoderic Random, and striking the man after he was down." This implies a rather close literary association between Smollett and Gordon.

Punching the noses of Groom and Gordon did not end Smollett's troubles with the notes. Gordon, who had owed Groom £59 "and upwards for board and lodging," gave his landlord in partial payment of his bill the following note indorsed by Smollett ("Whose hand Writing this Defendant [Groom] was then very Well Acquainted With"): <sup>1</sup>

London December 26th 1751. I promise to pay Six Months after date to Doctor Tobias Smollett on his Order the Sum of fifteen pounds value reced [received] by me Peter Gordon 15£<sup>2</sup>

The following day, February 24, 1753, Groom sent a messenger to Smollett about the note, by whom Smollett replied that the "note was good and that he would pay the Same and actually appointed a time for that purpose." <sup>3</sup> When Smollett did not live up to his verbal agreement, Groom "did Cause a Writt to be Sued out of his Majestyes Court of Kings Bench" <sup>4</sup> against Tobias Smollett. On the issuance of this writ Smollett was arrested. <sup>5</sup>

Two compensations, other than the vitriolic letter to Alexander Hume Campbell, remained to the wounded Smollett: the first, the memory of the blows which he laid on Gordon and Groom; the second, the thought that at the moment of the Chancery suit, Peter Gordon was "now an actual prisoner in the prison of the Fleet." <sup>6</sup>

Smollett's Chancery suit lagged; a Chancery affidavit states: "The said Def<sup>t</sup> [i.e. Groom] intends to Move the Court on Thursday next or as soon after as Councell can be had that the p<sup>ts</sup> [plaintiff's] Bill may stand Dismissed out of this Court for want of prosecution with Costs to be Taxed." <sup>7</sup> But the case was on Smollett's mind at least from May 18, 1753, to the time of this affidavit, May 31, 1755. Possibly the realization that his case was legally weak accounts for his neglect of the case. He was also during this time

<sup>1</sup> C12 2230/10, Answer of Edward Groom.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*      <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*      <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* This is an hitherto unknown episode in Smollett's life. The word "arrested" is Smollett's own: "actually lately put one of the said Notes in Suit against your orator and Caused him to be Arrested thereon." (C12 2230/10, Bill of Tobias Smollett.)      <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> C33/48, dated May 31, 1755. The development of the litigation was as follows: Groom had a writ issued against Smollett (this I have been unable to locate). Then after the assault, Gordon and Groom both sued Smollett in King's Bench and recovered damages. The matter of the notes was still unsettled, however, and Smollett, afraid that he would be touched for more money, sued Groom in Chancery. Affidavits in this Chancery suit will be found in C33/47 and 48.

involved in further financial difficulties. "But that," as Kipling would say, "is another story."<sup>1</sup>

H. P. VINCENT.

### COLERIDGE AND THE "ENQUIRER" SERIES

To Miss Dorothy Coldicutt's query, "Was Coleridge the Author of the 'Enquirer' Series in the *Monthly Magazine*, 1796-9?"<sup>2</sup> the answer can be returned that not Coleridge but the Rev. William Enfield was the author. This information is drawn from John Aikin's obituary notice of Enfield in the *Monthly Magazine* for November 1797.<sup>3</sup> The probability is that Enfield wrote the series from its beginning in February 1796 to September 1797 (Nos. 1-14). As to the subsequent authorship of the papers, Miss Coldicutt in her article gives some interesting information and conjectures.

With a view to forging stronger the link between Coleridge and the *Monthly Magazine*, Miss Coldicutt points out that he borrowed material from the *Monthly Magazine* to use in his *Watchman*. She concludes: "Coleridge had evidently come to some arrangement with Phillips [the publisher] which allowed him to use articles, sometimes with and sometimes without acknowledgement." But in the *Watchman*, in addition to at least four unacknowledged borrowings from the *Monthly Magazine*, there are three from

<sup>1</sup> Smollett was further annoyed during this period by going bail for an acquaintance. But since it is a separate story I shall tell it in another account.

Further material on Edward Groom is not especially desirable since the man is, except for his connection with Smollett, a nonentity. But for the sake of the record I wish to mention a case in King's Bench in which an Abraham Schuldham, executor of Robert Spare, suing through Charles Ballard, his attorney, brought "his certain Bill against Edward Groome being in the Custody of the Marshall of the Marshalsea" stating that "whereas the said Edward on the Twelfth day of September 1747 . . . at Aldeby . . . was indebted to the said Robert in his life time in One hundred and Twenty pounds of lawful money of Great Britain for the use and Occupation of one Messuage one Barn one Stable One hundred and Fifty Acres of Land One hundred Acres of Meadow One hundred Acres of Marsh and One hundred Acres of pasture with the Appurtenances." Groome denied that he should pay this money, that he had made no promises, but when the case came up before a jury three weeks after Trinity, Groome confessed, or as the marginal gloss has it, The Def<sup>t</sup> by his Attorney on Record/withdraws his/pleas & Confesseth/this Action." The folio does not have the statement of the amount of the damages.

This is a Norfolk case so that it is by no means certain that the Edward Groome sued by Schuldham is the Edward Groom assaulted by Tobias Smollett.

<sup>2</sup> R.E.S., xv. (January 1939), pp. 45-60.

<sup>3</sup> *Monthly Magazine*, iv. 400-2. Professor Arthur Beatty, so far as I know, was the first in recent times to record Enfield's authorship of the series. See his *William Wordsworth, His Doctrine and Art*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1927, p. 56 n. Professor Walter Graham also gives this information in *English Literary Periodicals*, New York, 1930, p. 189. A source for the attribution is not cited in these works.

William Tooke's *Varieties of Literature* (London, 1795), six from *Anthologia Hibernica* (Dublin, 1793-4),<sup>1</sup> and a number from newspapers. When it is considered that Coleridge in haste and desperation gathered his materials for the *Watchman* from various sources, it appears unlikely that any of his borrowings were the result of an arrangement with publishers.

That Coleridge made unsigned contributions to the *Monthly Magazine* is certainly a possibility. I believe, however, that Miss Coldicutt takes too seriously Coleridge's talk of having earned a substantial sum by such employment. For note his statements, as quoted by Miss Coldicutt. On December 12, 1796, he said: "I receive about forty guineas yearly from the *Critical Review* and the new *Monthly Magazine*." But on December 17 he said: "... by reviews, the magazine, and other shilling-scavenger employments, [I] shall probably gain forty pounds a year." [My italics.] What was a certainty in the first statement has declined in the second to mere expectation. Is this not typical of Coleridge's financial calculations?

LEWIS PATTON.

"NEUERE YETE IN GAME NE IN GRENE": A  
HAVELOK CRUX.

The phrase *neuere yete in game ne in grene* at line 996 of *Havelok the Dane* presents a problem which has not received satisfactory treatment. It occurs in a passage where the poet is paying homage to the excellent character of the hero:<sup>2</sup>

Of bodi was he mayden clene;  
Neuere yete in game, ne in grene,  
With hire ne wolde [he] leyke ne lye,  
No more þan it were a strie.

<sup>1</sup> Some unacknowledged borrowings in the *Watchman* (the first two were noted by Miss Coldicutt): In No. III: "Shakespeare MSS." (*Month. Mag.*, 1. 42-3); "Origin of the Maypole" (*Month. Mag.*, 1. 29). In No. IV: "The Hon. Admiral John Forbes" (*Month. Mag.*, 1. 157-8). In No. V: "Epigram on a late Marriage" (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 307); "Epigram on an Amorous Doctor" (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 307); "Of Smart Pretty Fellows" (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 142). In No. VI: Letter of Patrick O'Fleherly (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 101); "Provisions" (*Month. Mag.*, 1. 176). In No. VIII: "To a Primrose" (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 60). In No. IX: "Boissy the French Poet" (*Var. of Lit.*, 1. 422-5); Estonian ballads (*Var. of Lit.*, 1. 22-44); "A Madagascar Song" (*Var. of Lit.*, 1. 551); "Eating in Company" (*Anth. Hib.*, 1. 262); "Anecdotes of Persons connected with the French Revolution" (*Month. Mag.*, 1. 219-21). This list does not include items from newspapers.

<sup>2</sup> The quotation follows the text of the edition of W. W. Skeat revised by K. Sisam, Oxford, 1915, p. 37.

The assumption has generally been that *grene* here means "a green," "a grassy field," as it does in lines 2828 and 2840 of this same poem and commonly elsewhere in Middle English. Kölbing, feeling no doubt that two words meaning "play" and "field" were ill mates for an alliterative phrase, favoured an emendation of *game* to *gardine* which Holthausen accepts in his edition and which Sisam records without comment in a footnote. Kölbing's suggestion is not attractive and has little to be said for it except that it shows that he was aware of a difficulty. Henry Bradley, similarly aware, introduced into Stratmann's *Middle English Dictionary* another interpretation which seems to have passed almost unnoticed. Under *grēne* sb. he quotes this one passage, glosses the word as "discord, quarrel," and derives it from Old Norse *grein*: this is a characteristically brilliant suggestion but it presents two preliminary difficulties. First it requires a derivation from the East Scandinavian *grén* and parallels in Middle English with *grēne* (instead of the usual *greyn*, *graine*, etc., from the West Scandinavian *grein*) seem to be lacking. Secondly, there are apparently no traces in Middle English or in the modern dialects of *greyn*, *graine* in the meaning suggested by Bradley.<sup>1</sup> The case for such an interpretation of the word in *Havelok* is not therefore very good.

If one assumes for the moment that *game* is not corrupt, one will expect the word *grene* to mean either something very like *game* or else something more or less to the contrary; this follows from the very nature of such phrases. An examination of the Old and Middle English alliterative material containing the element *game(n)* suggests strongly that a synonym is to be expected.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the context of the *Havelok* passage does not readily allow the introduction of a word meaning "discord" and quite clearly favours a word meaning something similar to *game*. In the story of "St. Oswald and the Monk" in the Vernon Manuscript *Temporale* there is an interesting parallel which seems to have been overlooked.<sup>3</sup> The poem is

<sup>1</sup> See *N.E.D.* *grain* sb.<sup>2</sup>, *E.D.D.* *grain* sb.<sup>1</sup> Even in O.N. this meaning is a special one.

<sup>2</sup> See *N.E.D.* under *game* sb. and J. P. Oakden, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English, A Survey of the Traditions*, pp. 200, 240, 283, 326, 354, 374, where the "antonym type" seems to be entirely absent in phrases containing *game(n)* while the type *game* and *gle*, etc. (cf. *glam* and *gle*, p. 284) is exceedingly common. For the usage in O.N. see note,<sup>3</sup> p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Carl Horstmann, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, vol. 57. The passage occurs on p. 290, ll. 85-100 of item 32 of the *Temporale*. Beyond changing the punctuation I have not altered Horstmann's text.



dealing at this point with the adventures of the unfortunate monk :

At euen he was to chaumbre led  
And brouht wiþ þe Qwene in Bed.  
þe Qwen gon hym hule and Cus  
And huld him wake Maugrei his.  
þis Caityf hermite was hungri  
And feled hete of hire Bodi,  
And made buskyng to leyke on grene,  
And aftur help cried þe Qwene.  
Out of Bedde he was drawe  
And in a ffat wiþ cold water þrawe ;  
Longe he was holden in þat water  
And longe he gon his tef to chater.  
He was take vp and leyd aþeyn  
Riht beo þe Qwen and heo was bayn  
To cusse him and to make him redi  
his fflsches lust to do lecheri.

This establishes the existence of a phrase (*to*) *leyke in (on) grene*, and the sense of the above rules out Kölbing's *gardine* and gives little support to Bradley's suggestion. *To leyke on grene* evidently means something like "indulge in wanton amorous play," and *grene* is therefore more or less synonymous with *game* in the *Havelok* passage as seemed likely from the other lines of evidence.

A comparison at once suggests itself with the modern Scots *green* v.—"to long, yearn" which is recorded already in the Göttingen manuscript of the *Cursor Mundi*.<sup>1</sup> The etymology of this verb is not altogether clear, but it appears to be a borrowing from Old Norse *girna*—"to desire," with metathesis and vowel lengthening.<sup>2</sup> The verbal substantive *greening*—"yearning," "desire," is well attested in English areas where the verb occurs, but the modern dialects seem to preserve no other noun. There is, however, an Old Norse substantive *girmi*,<sup>3</sup> beside the commonly attested *girð*

<sup>1</sup> See *N.E.D.*, *E.D.D.* *green* v.<sup>3</sup>. The modern dialect word is recorded in Northumberland as well as in Scotland.

<sup>2</sup> The form was not familiar to the Fairfax scribe of *Cursor Mundi*, who writes *gered* (of native origin) where the Göttingen MS. has *greded*. *Cursor Mundi* also uses the adverb *gern*, *garn* (O.N. *gjarna*) beside the native *yern* (O.E. *georne*) and the adjective *gern* beside *jern(e)*.

<sup>3</sup> Recorded in *kappgirmi*, *singirmi* (beside the synonymous *kappgirð*, *singirð*). Cf. also the adjective *girmiligr*. The particular meaning "lust," "sexual desire," is very marked with *girð* (cf. also *Zoëga*, *girðar-bruni*, -*eldr*, -*hiti*—"ardent lust") and not so with the verb, which would help to explain why similarly in M.E. and later the verb has also no marked specialization of this sort, whereas the M.E. noun *grene* has. For a trace of it in the verbal noun cf. Wright's quotation from Picken, *Poems*, "Let us cleek it (*i.e.* "marry") Or the greenin' days gae doon." It is possible that other relevant cases of the noun *grene* have been wrongly interpreted as "grassy field." I have not been able to examine the quotation from Thomas Cutwode's *Calitha Poetarum* cited by the *N.E.D.* under *lake* v<sup>1</sup>, "Let the lasses giue over laaking in the greene." The phrase *leyke on grene* might well be used long after its specific meaning was forgotten.



—"desire," "lust," which might reasonably be expected to show the same development in Middle English as the related verb *girma*, thus giving the *grene* of the two passages quoted above.<sup>1</sup> The absence of the word in modern dialects is sufficiently accounted for by the presence of *greening*, just as already in Old English *geornung* and *geornnes* alone are used, and no word corresponding to O.H.G. *gernī*, Gothic *gairnei* is attested.<sup>2</sup>

Such a derivation of the noun *green* would support the meaning which the passage from the Vernon Manuscript seems to require. It is clear that *on grene* there, and *in game* and *in grene* side by side in *Havelok* serve to restrict the broad reference of *leyke* to a rather special kind of diversion. In Old Norse the use of *gaman* for "dalliance" is very common indeed, and though I can cite no instances where it is linked with *-girmi* or *girnð*, the two words would form a very appropriate pair, and a phrase \**girmi ok gaman* may well have existed beside the very frequent poetical *geð ok gaman* which is used specifically in situations of this sort.<sup>3</sup> The available evidence then strongly suggests that the noun *grene* should be interpreted as "lust" or "sensual pleasure," that it should be related to the verb *green*, and that the derivation of this verb from Old Norse *girma* should be accepted. The type of metathesis is not unparalleled. In general (especially in the north at an early date) the shift of *r* tends to be in the opposite direction,<sup>4</sup> but *gride*, "to strike" (*Alexander*, Lydgate), beside the normal *gird*<sup>5</sup> gives evidence of a possible forward movement of *r* in a position of this sort. The *ē* is likely to have arisen before the metathesis, probably under the influence of the adverb and adjective and the native forms, which

<sup>1</sup> After this was written I noticed that Madden long ago put forward this derivation: it is contemptuously dismissed by Holthausen, *Anglia*, XV, p. 500.

<sup>2</sup> The noun *softgerne*, "luxuria," in *Trinity Homilies* may be from such a lost O.E. noun, but Norse influence here is not out of the question.

<sup>3</sup> The type of usage is seen in *Hárbarzlióð* 18 (ed. Neckel, p. 78), "Hvilda ek hiá þeim systrom síau/ok hafða ek geð þeira allt ok gaman." Cf. *Hávamál* 161. For *gaman* alone in such contexts, cf. *Hárbarzlióð* 30:

lék ek við ina línhvito      ok launþing háðak,  
gladdak ina gullþigrtu,      gamni mæi undi.

Here the usage with the dative *gamni* is significantly like the M.E. *on (in) game*. For the use of *game(n)* in English in this meaning, see *N.E.D.* *game* sb. and *play* sb. 6c. where the phrase *play and game* is recorded.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. late Northumbrian *birdas* for West Saxon *briddas* and M.E. *girn* instead of *grin* (*N.E.D.* *girn* v<sup>1</sup>, v<sup>2</sup>, sb<sup>1</sup>), *girdle* (*N.E.D.* sb<sup>2</sup>) for *griddle*, etc.

<sup>5</sup> See *N.E.D.* *gird* v<sup>1</sup>, *gride* v. *Board* sb. sometimes undergoes the same treatment. Compare also Northern Middle English *brust* "bristle" beside O.N. *burst*.

would have that vowel before the group *rn*.<sup>1</sup> But for this analogical influence one would expect Middle English forms with \**grīne* as well as *grēne*.

ANGUS McINTOSH

<sup>1</sup> That the analogy was general and the metathesis sporadic is suggested by the form *gern* vb. which Wright (*E.D.D.*) records from Yorkshire. He notes that beside *greded*, *Cursor Mundi* has also a form of the past participle *gernd* (l. 16185). It is worth remarking that though the language of the Vernon MS. *Temporale* is popularly described as southern (e.g. Wells, *Manual*, p. 290), it contains many characteristic northern words and forms, as might be expected in a text which draws upon northern material; the Norse element is almost as strong as in *Havelok*.

## REVIEWS

**Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century.** Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1939. 8vo. Pp. xxii+394. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS volume completes, after nearly twenty years' labour, Professor Carleton Brown's gleanings of the lyrics, mainly religious, of three centuries from 1200 to 1500. They represent the sifting of the immense amount of material of which Professor Brown has a unique knowledge, and to record that the poems have been selected with the same discrimination and edited with the same patient scholarship as those in his earlier volumes is to say all that need be said on the subject. Actually the present collection comprises 192 pieces, of which over a third have never been printed before; while, if we include these now published in greatly superior versions, the new pieces amount to well over half the total number.

It was once the fashion to describe the fifteenth century as, from the poetical point of view, the trough of a wave, a dreary depression separating the crests of Chaucer on the one hand and Surrey and Wyatt on the other. One of the first and most important steps towards a juster estimate of the period was taken in the brilliant study that Gregory Smith contributed to Saintsbury's *Periods of European Literature*, while a few years later A. W. Pollard was arguing with sweet reasonableness that, after all, the century that saw the flowering of the religious drama and the birth of the popular ballad could hardly be dismissed as poetically sterile in our national literature. Certainly there is abundant evidence of vitality in the present collections: a vitality of creation as well as mere abundance of production. The editor tells us that from the material he has collected it would have been easy to compile a volume ten times the size. That need not astonish us, for surely no one ever doubted the prolificity of the fifteenth century! The collection has, indeed, been reduced to manageable dimensions largely by omitting the work of all authors already easily accessible and many well-

known individual poems. Possibly the average quality has suffered, but whether seriously may be doubted. In any case Professor Brown has not sought to skim the cream: what he has wisely tried to do is to make his selection representative of the various styles, modes, and tendencies of the time, rather than to give only such poems as recommend themselves to present-day tastes and standards. By doing so he has given his modest volume a value of its own, as one in which we may see, from one particular angle at least, that distressful century in its true form and colours.

But when to the best of our abilities we have freed our minds of popular misconceptions and half-truths, it remains a fact that the fifteenth century gave England no poet of the first rank, and my own impression is that in essential poetic quality the lyrics of this anthology do not quite come up to the level of those of the earlier centuries. This may be a matter of personal taste (just as I find the illumination of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for all its technical excellence, less interesting than that of the twelfth and thirteenth) and I would not be thought to depreciate their qualities. Still it seems to me that there are fewer lyrics that, like the famous "I sing of a maiden" (81), are quite of the first water.

In reviewing the *Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* I spoke of a peculiar dry flavour that seemed characteristic. Reading through the present gleanings of the fifteenth century we are again, I think, aware of a flavour of its own, one recognizable as that of some of the most striking portions of the religious drama. I shall not attempt to characterize it, but it is very different from that of earlier times. The dry epigrammatic touch of the thirteenth century is now rare, though it survives occasionally, as in the remarkable lines printed for the first time from a manuscript in the Advocates' Library (111):

I haue laborede sore and suffered deȝȝth,  
and now I Rest and draw my breyght;  
but I schall come and call Ryght sone  
heuene and erght and hell to dome;  
and thane schall know both devyll and mane,  
What I was and what I ame

and to some extent also in Bishop Pecock's quatrain (119). We may find it modified in a curious "carolle", that in a manner recalls *Earth upon Earth*, beginning (118):

God a-geynst nature iij thyngys hath wrought:  
first of the vyle erth made mane with-out man,  
Then womane with-out woman of man made of nought,  
And man without mane In woman than

while something older still seems to echo down the ages in a hitherto unprinted poem on the Resurrection (112):

Be glaid, ye angellis and ye archangellis cleir !  
 ȝoure wailȝeand prince, victorius in battall,  
 Met with all hevinlie melody and cheir ;  
 And to ȝoure king ȝe sing, ' haill, victour, haill ! '

though it is, of course, a mere accident that " wailȝeand prince " (valiant prince) should recall the " wealdend god " of Cynewulf.

It is interesting that, just as the influence of the lyric has been traced in the religious drama, so Professor Brown finds a reflex influence of the drama upon the lyric (pp. xxi-xxiii). Still more evident, of course, is the influence of the folk ballad. We meet it in many poems ; most directly, in spite of its Latin refrain, in a song on the murder of St. Thomas (123):

Herkenud lordyngus, grete & smale,  
 ych wole ȝow telle a wondur tale,  
 how holy churche was brout to bale  
 cum magna iniuria

but most surprisingly in a touch, if a touch only, of that haunting other-world quality, familiar in the *Lyke-wake Dirge* (and traceable, I suggested, in the thirteenth-century *Corpus Christi*) to be found in the carol, " Mery hyt ys in may mornynge " (116):

And By a chapell as y Came,  
 Mett y wyhte Ihū to chyrcheward gone  
 Petur and Pawle, thomas & Ihon,  
 And hys desyplys Euery-chone.

Owre lorde offeryd whate he wolde,  
 A challes alle off ryche rede golde ;  
 Owre lady, ȝe crowne off hyr mowide,  
 The sone owte off hyr Bosome schone.

No doubt it is these poems of the popular tradition, together with genuine simplicity of Rate's morning and evening prayers (128-9) and the even more elemental quality of an anonymous evening prayer written as prose in MS. Harley 541 and now printed for the first time (127), that will appeal to modern taste, rather than those in the aureate style of literary fashion. Moreover, these latter unfortunately tend to the elaboration of theological conceptions—

Heyl ! that conceyved and bere with-ouen peyne  
 The second person in the trynityte, (30)

Annunciat by Aungell was thy concepcioun,  
 Without originall synne as diuerse maketh mencion (69)—

this is no doubt excellent doctrine, but it is idle to pretend that it is poetry. That there is no essential incompatibility is proved by a poem on the eucharist in the popular tradition (114):

It is bred fro heuene cam,  
ffleych & blod of mary it nam;  
ffor þe synns of adam  
he sched his blod þat was so red

but it is seldom that theology and poetry are wedded as in *Veni Coronaberis* (37):

ffor macula, modur, was neuur in þe,  
ffilia syon, þu arte þe flowre!  
full swetely shalte þu sytte by me,  
And were a crowne wyth me in towre;  
And all myn angelles to þyn honowre  
Shall þe worshyppe in heuen blysse.  
Thow, blessed body þat bare in bowre,  
Veni coronaberis.

This, however, finds its inspiration in the *Song of Songs*, and the erotic tradition of course persists: if its object is not Christ or the Virgin it may be a "louely angell" as in 132-4:

My keper so swete, myne Aungelle so fre!

It is interesting to note the common phrasing in one "Oracio ad proprium angelum" (132):

I Praye þe, spirit, þat angell arte  
To whom .y. ame be-take,  
That þu me kepe in clene lyf,  
Wheþer .y. slepe or wake

and in Rate's morning hymn (129):

Ihū, lord, blyssed þu be!  
ffore all þis nyght þu hast me kepe  
ffrome þe feud & his poste,  
wheþer I wake or þat I slepe.

Such echoes are frequent, so is the use of one popular tag or refrain in a series of different compositions, and the deliberate imitation or rehandling of earlier models. One of the most charming lyrics in the volume (17) is no more than a paraphrase of the famous thirteenth-century hymn "Of on þat is so fayr and brygt". Add to this the often widely different versions of the same poem found in several manuscripts, and we get some idea of how wide the currency and distribution of the religious verse of the time, how close the action and reaction of one popular or fashionable composition

on another, and how undefined the idea of personal authorship were. The language of piety was very much a *lingua franca*.

One point in conclusion. Professor Brown remarks as a new note in the poetry of the time the idea of Death as Friend. In illustration he prints two poems. Of one (163) it may be fair to say that it "ignores completely the terrors of death and centres attention instead upon the hopes of heaven", for it contains phrases such as "ded is opynly ende off werdes wo" and "ded sal be pi sawl frend, & erthly lyff pi ffo". But I am a little doubtful of what he calls the "Still more remarkable testimony" of the other (164). There is here no mention of death, and it would be possible to see in "the porte of peese" no more than a state of grace or even the sanctuary of the church. Be this, however, as it may, the poem was well worth preserving for its own sake:

Howe cometh al ye That ben y-brought  
In bondes,—full of bitter besynesse  
of erthly luste, abydyng in your thought?  
Here ys the reste of all your besynesse,  
Here ys the porte of peese, & restfulnes  
to them that stondesth In stormes of dysese,  
only refuge to wrechis In dystrese,  
and all comforte of myschefe & mysese.

W. W. GREG.

**On Rereading Chaucer.** By H. R. PATCH. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Pp. xiv+269. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

ON first reading Chaucer even a casual reader must be immediately impressed by the author's sterling qualities of good spirit and health, and that this first impression is correct Professor Patch amply testifies in his new book. In more than one passage of brilliant critical insight he advances far towards proving that among the poets Geoffrey Chaucer is the supreme humourist of our English tongue. From this study of the comic spirit one receives a deeper understanding and wider appreciation of the individual genius which produced the *Canterbury Tales*. For if there is in the depiction of the Canterbury pilgrims a subtlety which is French and also occasionally a German grotesquery, it is Chaucer's individual genius which has fused these elements into an art at once international and universal in its appeal.

The element of humour is a thread of gold in both the greater and



the lesser works. It dazzles when the oft-married Wife of Bath is unable to fathom why the Samaritan woman's fifth man was not her fifth husband as well, and it gleams not wanly amid the barren spaces of the *House of Fame* in the discourse of the talkative eagle. There is even humour in *Troilus and Cressida*, especially where Troilus, peering down from heavenly heights, laughs at his earlier follies; for here it is the spirit of humour, of seeing things more in correct proportion, which serves to cancel the pain of what otherwise would be an unbearably cynical conclusion. This sense of proportion was undeniably strong in Chaucer: he could write almost romantically about chivalry in the *Knight's Tale*, although as one of the Canterbury narrators he preferred to tell himself the ludicrous story of Sir Thopas. Moreover, and this should encourage the rereading of Chaucer, Professor Patch observes that there is almost a humour of sources, that the poet often took passages from serious works to gain a comic effect, that sometimes he apparently meant the joke for himself alone. Certainly no demoniac urge or divine frenzy seems to have impelled Chaucer; instead he appears to have experienced a sense of joy, of fun in writing.

As explained in the "Preface," three of the ten essays in *On Rereading Chaucer* (i.e. Chaps. IV, VII, VIII) have appeared hitherto in American periodicals. Although the discussion for the most part centres on the theme of humour, Professor Patch has not focused the volume on one lone thesis. There are accordingly not a few other topics which deserve every reader's attention.

A second theme argued in *On Rereading Chaucer* is that behind all Chaucer's works there may be found a moral conviction or moral aim. This argument is not unsupported by evidence and comes as a welcome antidote to the popular conception of the poet as a mere entertainer. In the satiric tales there can hardly be questions as to the moral purpose. Moreover, in the chapter entitled "Chaucer and the Common People" Professor Patch appears fundamentally sound in holding that Chaucer saw something not wholly "Merry" in England, that he was kindly disposed in his view of the lower classes, and that he was keenly aware of existing injustices when asking the King in *Lak of Stedfastnesse* to cherish his folk and hate extortion.

Although, as Professor Patch states, Chaucer would have drunk his drink with anyone of them, which Canterbury pilgrim would he have sought for intimacy? In seeking to discover moral purpose

in Chaucer's nature, Professor Patch suggests the Clerk as most likely: both were fond of study; both might be touched by a pathetic tale. Again, the poet was fond of youth. But was Chaucer, like the Clerk, serious, philosophical, moral? What of that other young gentleman, the Squire? One cannot forget that Chaucer himself has sometimes been considered the Squire's prototype: both were fond of writing poetry, and both were not ascetics but young men very much in touch with the times.

In fact, as for evidence that Chaucer was in any respect a moralist, it might rather appear that he disapproved this type of personality in labelling Gower and Strode, respectively, as moral and philosophical. However this may be, Professor Patch further contends that Chaucer's "poems of Courtly Love were meant to celebrate devotion, not of the secret lover for his *amie*, but, within the bonds of matrimony, of perfectly domestic attachments." This is a very pretty picture, but such poems of faithless love as the *Complaint of Mars*, the *Complaint of Venus*, and *Anelida and Arcite* do not at all fit the frame. For another thing, although Chaucer was doubtless no libertine, it is equally unlikely that "in his private life he was after all pretty much the hermit." It is one thing to hold that Chaucer was a reformer, social and political no less than moral; but it is quite another to hold that he was a moralist.

In the chapter on "The Court of Love" Professor Patch, after treating Gaunt's family and the *Book of the Duchess*, declares that he also could "work out a very neat interpretation of the *House of Fame* and the *Parliament of Fowls* with reference to the family." There is little if any evidence for this declaration. In view of poems referring to such diverse personages as Graunson, Bukton, and even Queen Anne, it accordingly may be seriously questioned whether or not any appreciable number of Chaucer's poems may be linked even tentatively with the interests of one family group. However, since Professor Patch seems deeply impressed with the Lancastrian influence, it appears a striking oversight that he nowhere so much as mentions Shirley's contemporary or almost contemporary testimony that the *Complaint of Mars* was written "at þe commandement of þe renommed and excellent prynce my lord þe duc John of Lancastre."

In general, Professor Patch's remarks are most to the point where he discusses philosophy, as in the *Troilus*, or satire, as in *Sir Thopas*, or humour, as in the *Wife of Bath's Tale*. The commentary in *On Rereading Chaucer* is largely impressionistic, but it is impression-

ism of a high order : pleasing in good taste, sparkling in wit. Whatever may be the sources of Chaucer's moral view of the world, Professor Patch has established that his humour is modern, for although Chaucer is deeply critical, it is a criticism which wounds little and heals much. One of the great masterpieces of all time, the *Canterbury Tales* when read and reread is ever that tonic rare which exhilarates even while it chastens.

HALDEEN BRADDY.

**John Skelton. Laureate.** By WILLIAM NELSON. [Number 139 of the Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.] New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. x+266. 15s. net.

THIS timely and serviceable volume is one which is and will remain indispensable to students of Skelton. It gathers together from many scattered and remote sources all the little bits of information about Skelton that have been exhibited since Dyce's edition of 1843, adds a considerable number of new records, and, first of any work since Dyce, does a thorough job. The book, in spite of the author's disclaimer, is complete in itself, proceeding from a sound and scholarly sketch of the humanistic background against which Skelton appeared to an ordered and orderly chronological discussion of his life and work. If one were required to select chapters of especial interest and value, possibly "The Origin of Skeltonic Rhyme," "The Quarrel with Wolsey," refurbished from the author's earlier articles and discussion with H. L. R. Edwards in *P.M.L.A.*, and "The Court of Henry VIII," in which he shows minute, day-by-day evidence for a theory that Skelton accompanied Henry to the Field of the Cloth of Gold, would call for special mention.

Nor does it lessen the value of the book to confess that in each of these cases the point, though brilliantly maintained, is not proved beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Nelson would derive Skeltonics, apparently exclusively, from mediæval Latin rhymed prose, and his argument seems quite convincing. Other sources, however, have been equally plausibly proposed. Moreover, in his discussion and in his analysis of Skeltonics, pp. 83-8, Nelson ignores their alliterative quality. It would probably not be difficult to parallel

in Latin rhymed prose Skelton's fondness for irregular alliteration, but it is also possible, to make still another suggestion, that the so-called Skeltonic metre came to Skelton on the underground stream of alliterative verse that continued from Old English times to, and far beyond, the "Alliterative Revival." In short, although Nelson makes an extremely strong case for rhymed prose as the father of Skelton's rhyme, one cannot but feel that it is safest for the present to reserve judgment.

Precisely similar is the feeling of the present reviewer regarding the whole "Quarrel with Wolsey." Nelson has worked it out in narrow and minute detail, he has made "Speke Parot" for the first time intelligible, and has added richly to the interpretation of other poems, but one feels that we have not yet got the complete story. Possibly it is only the shock with which we read of the ignominious end of Skelton's private war, when this bonny fighter bends a servile knee to Wolsey and fawns upon him for temporal rewards, that causes one to demur. Nevertheless, although Nelson makes the case as clear as day and presents it in inescapable detail, it remains incredible that this savage satirist should end as a time-server.

The chapter dealing with the Court of Henry VIII, and proposing that Skelton went to France with Henry, is equally well presented; and the whole book is stimulating.

Nelson quite properly feels, however, that more can be learned about Skelton. In the first place, a work of equal value could be done on the folk elements in his poetry. There is not only the possibility that his fondness for alliteration derives from folk sources, but his work is full of tags of popular song and *sprichwort*. When Nelson says, p. 54: "It is, therefore, in terms of the humanist tradition established at the court of Henry VII that John Skelton must be interpreted," he is abundantly correct: from that contention springs this valuable work. But it is equally true that it is in terms of folk tradition and motif that he must be interpreted, for John Skelton's humanism was only the upper crust of a soul that was thoroughly at one with the English folk. It is perhaps because Nelson is set upon the humanistic tradition, and blind to the other, that he finds an "underlying moral purpose" in *Elynour Rummyng*. If there is such a purpose, it must be buried deep indeed. On the other hand, one of the healthiest of folk motifs is that of the repulsive food-handler. Thus we have Chaucer's Cook with a mormal, Shakespeare's wife of Dromio in *The Comedy of Errors*, and thus the

"dirty old cook" of this summer's latest military or backwoods camp. We even find in Skelton, in the envoy to the *Garlande*, an echo of the commonplace mediæval pre-occupation of romance writers and others concerning the English language :

Go, litill quaire,  
Demene you faire ;  
Take no dispare  
Though I you wrate  
After this rate  
In Englysshe letter ;  
So moche the better  
Welcome shall ye  
To sum men be :  
For Latin warkis  
Be good for clerkis.

The astonishing list of romances in *Phyllip Sparowe* is also evidence that Skelton is not to be interpreted exclusively against the background of Renaissance learning.

It may be pointed out, incidentally, that in building up the humanistic background, carrying the English tradition as far back as 1400, Nelson seems to have missed an opportunity in connection with Skelton's translation of Diodorus Siculus. Skelton translated not from Greek but from the Latin translation of Diodorus by Poggio Bracciolini. Nelson does not seem to realize that Poggio, whom Wright and Sinclair call "the most striking figure in Latin literature during the first half of the fifteenth century," who "won fame in three separate branches of learning," and whose "great achievements in all alike render him a typical Renaissance figure,"<sup>1</sup> actually visited England in 1418 and received a benefice worth 120 florins from Cardinal Beaufort, whose guest he was.<sup>2</sup> There is everything in Poggio's character and in his achievements—and very little in those of Diodorus—to attract Skelton to him. His *Facetiae* went through dozens of editions—Skelton had a great reputation as a wit, a "merry tales" figure. Poggio carried on an abusive controversy with Filelfo as Skelton did with Garnesche. Both were translators and disseminators of learning. It may even be possible to trace a faint personal connection between the two, for the Lady Margaret, mother of Henry VII and a great patroness of

<sup>1</sup> *A History of Later Latin Literature*, London : George Routledge & Sons, 1931, p. 342.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. Wm. Shepherd, *The Life of Poggio Bracciolini*, Liverpool, 1802 ; Second edition, 1837, p. 123.

learning, was grand-niece and heiress of Cardinal Beaufort<sup>1</sup>; and it is quite possible that "the kinges moder poete" who received £3 6s. 8d. on December 3, 1497, from the king's privy purse<sup>2</sup> was Skelton. Other poets are possible, but as the Lady Margaret was entrusted with the education of the princes and as Skelton claims to have translated the *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* at her request,<sup>3</sup> there would seem to be a chain of personal relationships connecting "John Skelton, Humanist" with his distinguished predecessor.

A few trivial matters may be mentioned. On p. 49 it is implied that *Magnifycence* is a "tract on the subject of government." It is true that Ramsay has identified the chief character with Henry VIII, but the play has little to do with anything but personal self-government.

P. 65: "When Skelton was introduced by Caxton in 1489." The phrase is perhaps correct, but unfortunate. Actually, Caxton paid suit to Skelton for favour in 1489. Skelton had at that time an established reputation.

P. 74: "Final proof that the occasion of the poem was the ceremony at which Henry was created Duke of York is offered, I think, by the line, 'En nous Ebra[u]cus merito redimitus honore.' The modern editor prints 'Ebrancus,' which means nothing. It should be 'Ebraucus,' the mythical founder of York, and the date 1494 is therefore certainly correct." The modern editor happens to be the present reviewer. As the *Speculum* never was edited before, but was "lost" for several hundred years, Nelson does not err on the side of generosity. As for *Ebrancus*, I presume that is what the manuscript had, although Nelson correctly charges me with another misprint, *regie* for *regi*. I dare not trust my memory to state categorically that u's and n's are clearly distinguished in the manuscript, but I believe they are. In any case, the forms *Ebraucus* and *Ebrancus* are interchangeable in York records. In Drake's *Eboracum* both forms may be found, and the word is usually Englished to *Ebrank*, as in Camden's "There happy Ebrank's lofty towers appear." *Ebrancus*, therefore, means just as much as *Ebraucus*, and what I ought to have printed was what the manuscript had. No emendation was required. As Henry could be called the "new Ebrank" at any time between his creation as Duke of York and his coronation,

<sup>1</sup> H. C. Cooper, *Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby*, ed. J. E. B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1874, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. Cf. also MS. Add. 7099, fol. 40.

<sup>3</sup> *Garlande of Laurell*, v. 1, 219.



I do not see how this compliment can be turned into "final proof" that the poem was written specifically and "certainly" in 1494, although I still think, as I did when I published the *Speculum*,<sup>1</sup> that it *may* have been written at that date.

If I may be forgiven for inserting another retort in this review, Nelson is sceptical of my suggestion that Skelton may have been tutor to Prince Arthur as well as Prince Henry. His argument is that Arthur already had a tutor, the blind poet Andre. As I pointed out, there is no reason why Arthur may not have had more than one tutor, especially if that one was both French and blind. On p. 65 Nelson concludes that in 1489 "it is certain that he [Skelton] had sought royal service, and it is probable that he had already achieved it." If so, he had achieved it two years before Prince Henry was born, and at a time when Caxton, dedicating a book to Arthur, asks favour of Skelton. After that date we have to wait a number of years for Henry to be born and to age sufficiently for tutoring before finding any definite employment at court for Skelton, and there is little material of any kind, and no records, to fill this gap in his life-story. I did not claim that Skelton did tutor Arthur, but Nelson, while challenging the suggestion, provides further reason for thinking that he may have done so.

Finally, Nelson's book makes us hope that several other pieces of work on Skelton may soon be done. An edition of Diodorus has been promised by the E.E.T.S. We need also a definitive edition of his poems, rather than the popular excerpts from Dyce that continue to appear, and we need a discussion of the folk elements that enter into Skelton's work. If these things can be as well done as Nelson's volume, which may inspire them, we shall be fortunate indeed, and Skelton will at last assume his rightful place in the history of English literature.

F. M. SALTER.

**European Balladry.** By W. J. ENTWISTLE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. xii+404. 17s. 6d. net.

In this penetrating book Professor Entwistle has presented the results of a long and systematic study of the ballad poetry of most of Europe. It is not the smallest merit of his survey that it has a freshness and ease of exposition which reflects the author's own enthusiasm and should assure for it a wide appreciation.

<sup>1</sup> *Speculum*, ix. 25-37.



The volume is divided into two sections. In the first the author deals with "ballads in general" and what he says there is based mainly on the detailed analysis of the balladry of separate countries (and groups of countries) which forms the second and larger section on "ballads in particular." As a result the conclusions are well documented and the reader who questions some theory in the first section will usually find the evidence for it set forth specifically in the latter part of the book. What may be allowed the title of "ballad" is a difficult problem of which the author shows abundant awareness. If the term is to be applied to a particular kind of poetry in a number of countries where verse-form and traditions of music and theme are inherently different, it must necessarily have a certain vagueness. This is sufficiently obvious from Professor Entwistle's analysis of material from Eastern Europe: he has shown how numerous and complex the conditions are which control the specific type of a country and how what one might call the "ballad attitude" finds expression in many different ways. The conditions are endlessly variable and they may change the type till it ceases to be really a ballad at all, as in France; they may prevent its development more or less completely as in Wales or Iceland, or hold it back till comparatively late times, as in Gaelic literature. Balladry is not a necessary attribute of a people, and the author has given a clear picture of the environment in which it is most likely to flourish. Often the comparative absence of true ballad poetry is due to the prevalence of some other literary form, like the *ríma* in Iceland, which prevented the acceptance of the Scandinavian *vise* in that conservative country. Still more often, for example in France and southern England, the ballad withers in the presence of a cultured and sophisticated literature, though sometimes, as in Denmark, where the type is old, it can survive and even profit by the contact. The debts of balladry to other types of literature are exceedingly interesting, and Professor Entwistle has shown how great and numerous these are. One is reminded how many of the themes are comparatively late and "literary" and how often form and technique are bound up with that of the more sophisticated lyric. An example is the influence of the *aubade* in Germany. For England the author might have made something of the significance and nature of the *carole*, an imported type which became immensely popular quite early and which must have had a direct influence in form and in music upon the ballad

as we know it. And remembering the hostility of the Church to *caroles* and suchlike frivolities, one may suspect a certain relationship between its power in various countries and the fertility of these in ballad production. The question of tunes Professor Entwistle has considered in outline, and he stresses the importance of this somewhat neglected and always complex subject, showing how close the interconnection often is between musical developments and verse form.

Both tunes and themes have their migrations, and the author has given some interesting examples of ballads (like the Breton *The Sailors* and the north Italian *Donna Lombarda*) scattering out over all Europe. Northern Italy is one of the key-points of distribution, as it is for so much else in literature. And the northern sea-ways carried poems back and forth: thus Brittany shares many things with the Teutonic countries and Scotland is linked closely to Scandinavia. It would be ungrateful to point to gaps in a broad survey of this kind. Professor Entwistle has given full references to the main ballad collections and he has paid fitting homage to the great workers in the field. For eastern Europe Mme. Hedwig Lüdeke's *Ungarische Balladen* and her valuable work on Greek ballads claims mention. The Gaelic material would be particularly worth studying because of its many differences from the rest of balladry in the west. Much is accessible (some of it with translations) in Reidar Christiansen's *The Vikings and the Viking Wars in Irish and Gaelic Tradition*.

A final word of praise is due to the author for the skill with which he has rendered into English so many illuminating and pleasant quotations from some of Europe's finest balladry.

ANGUS MCINTOSH.

**The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude.** By J. E. BERNARD, Jr.  
New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey  
Milford. 1939. Pp. xii+227. 14s. net.

IN this book, the result of work done for a Ph.D. at Yale, Mr. Bernard takes the term "interlude" in its broadest sense and gives a detailed analysis, from the point of view of prosody, of seventy interludes, all, with the exception of the *Interludium de Clerico et Puella*, falling between 1497 and 1593. There will, no doubt, be objections to the term "interlude" as applied to some of these plays; I cannot,

for example, feel happy about the inclusion of the whole of Lindsay's *Satire of the Three Estates*.

A much more serious objection to any study attempting such accuracy as this arises from the difficulty of dating many of these plays and from corrupt texts. Thus, for example, Mr. Bernard dates the *Satire of the Three Estates* as 1535, but, as Hamer in his edition of Lindsay for the Scottish Text Society shows, there is no record of the play before 1540, and this text does not exist. The existing texts are the portions (so-called "interludes") of the 1552 play found in the Bannatyne MS. and the 1554 version, which is longer than either of its predecessors. This is the version used by Mr. Bernard and dated 1535, an error of nineteen years. In other pieces the dates given by Mr. Bernard differ from those given by Chambers in his *Medieval Stage*. Strangely enough, Chambers' name does not appear in Mr. Bernard's bibliography.

Mr. Bernard objects to Saintsbury's summary dismissal of most of the verse of the interludes as doggerel, and concludes from his analysis that, although often prosodically uncertain, the verse can be classified into definite forms. Moreover, he thinks that many of the authors consciously varied these forms to suit the characters of the speakers. Thus, for example, virtuous or serious parts were often presented in ballad measures, bad parts in rime couée.

All this is interesting and demonstrated with exceptional care, but I cannot help thinking that it was unnecessary to go to the length of working out the percentages of the different kinds of lines in each piece to the first decimal place, especially as the number of lines is often doubtful.

N. R. TEMPEST.

#### **A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto, 1594-1709.** By

HENRIETTA C. BARTLETT and ALFRED W. POLLARD, revised and extended by Henrietta C. Bartlett. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1939. 4to. Pp. vi + 165. \$10.00; 56s. 6d. net.

It is to us a pointed comment on the civilization in which scholarship is supposed to have its place, that the first edition of this well-known and valuable guide appeared in the middle of one war, and that a revised edition now appears at the beginning of another. But that, of course, is an insular view: on both occasions America was at peace with the world.

It is obviously unnecessary to describe a work that is familiar to every serious student of Shakespeare's text : what is of interest is to note the points at which the present edition differs from its predecessor. Twenty-three years have had an appreciable effect on the distribution of copies. A good many new ones have come to light : many have changed hands. The Clawson collection has been dispersed, and the Pforzheimer formed ; most of the White books have gone to Harvard, and the Crichton Stuart quartos have become accessible. The most important events, however, that have occurred are undoubtedly the incorporation of the Bridgewater collection in the Huntington Library and the opening of the Folger Shakespeare Library. Most of the Folger quartos were indeed already located in the first edition of the *Census*, but in many cases little or nothing was known of their condition and even their identity was sometimes in doubt, so that several have changed their places in the course of revision. Mr. Folger collected six copies of the "N. Butter" edition of *King Lear* in the belief that it was the first : he possessed only a single fragmentary copy of the true first, or "Pied Bull," edition : a second, lacking only the title, has been purchased for the Library since his death. All these changes are meticulously recorded by Miss Bartlett in her revised *Census*, and the descriptions of first and other important editions have often been considerably extended. For these blessings very cordial thanks are due to one of the most conscientious, unselfish, and indefatigable of bibliographers, and, we learn, to the generosity of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University which made publication possible.

It would be idle to pretend, however, that our gratitude is not shot through with some regrets. The greatest is for the absence of the introduction by Mr. Pollard, which formed a pleasing and instructive adjunct to the original *Census*. No doubt the lapse of nearly a quarter of a century has rendered it in some ways out of date, and it is a matter of profound regret that Mr. Pollard's health should not have allowed him to revise it himself, for we can understand that pious scruples may have deterred his collaborator from laying hands on it. But it would surely not have been a difficult or an unduly arduous task to append to it a postscript drawing attention to the points at which revision had become necessary and giving some account of the changes in distribution that had occurred. The couple of introductory pages contributed by Miss Bartlett make no attempt at anything of the sort. There

may well, however, have been circumstances unknown to a reviewer which prevented such a course being taken.

Another regret concerns the exclusion of *Pericles*. Though not in the First Folio it has now become definitely if rather illogically a recognized part of the Shakespeare canon. The reason given in 1916 for its exclusion was that Sidney Lee had recently included a census of copies in the introduction to the Oxford Press facsimile; but to repeat that excuse to-day seems unreasonable. If Miss Bartlett's *Census* required revising I am sure Lee's did. Another exclusion is explained by Miss Bartlett as follows: "The first edition of this *Census* . . . omitted the two parts [II and III] of *Henry VI*, which appeared respectively as: *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, 1594* . . . and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, 1595* . . . since they were there regarded as the work of other men, revised later by Shakespeare. They are now considered early drafts of his own work, but are not included in this revised edition." This is hardly a correct account of the change that has taken place in critical opinion regarding these plays. No one, surely, believes the *Contention* and *True Tragedy* as they stand to be Shakespeare's own early drafts of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*. The old view contemplated source-plays on which Shakespeare built. The modern postulates piratical mutilation, and the necessity for supposing any but Shakespearean authorship incidentally disappears. Whether the pirated plays were identical with the Folio versions is a subsidiary question; but to set "early drafts" as alternative to source-plays is misleading. In any case, if the plays in question are admittedly Shakespeare's, why are they excluded? Either the modern view, as expressed and apparently endorsed by Miss Bartlett, is wrong, or the *Contention* and *True Tragedy* have every bit as rightful a place in the *Census* as *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives*.

No doubt a close examination of the descriptions might reveal oversights and errors, of whose existence no one, says Miss Bartlett, is better aware than herself; but it is a fair guess that they would prove few and unimportant. In the collation of the first edition of *King Lear*, "Title, 1 leaf" if accurate is inadequate: the title was in fact printed on the second leaf of a half-sheet [A]<sup>2</sup>, of which the blank first leaf survives in the Verulam copy. The catchword on E1, given as "*Kent*", should have a full stop. The perfect copy at the British Museum (now, I observe, definitely identified as the

Loscombe) was bought from Halliwell in 1858 together with the imperfect copy, as recorded in Mr. Pollard's discarded introduction. Again complete uniformity and consistency of description was obviously unattainable, and has admittedly not been attempted. Only in the case of the Harvard (Mostyn) copy of *King Lear* are we told which sheets are in the corrected and which in the original state, though for six other copies (all those generally known at the time) the information was worked out by Daniel in 1885 from data supplied in the Cambridge Shakespeare in 1866. Two other small points occur to me. "Undescribed" does not seem quite the right word for the edition of 1 *Henry IV* represented by the unique fragment in the Folger Library. No doubt it has never been fully described, since only a single sheet (C, which, by the way, is itself slightly defective) is preserved; but the word rather suggests something unrecorded, and is reminiscent of the sale catalogue. "Indescribable" is nearer to what Miss Bartlett seems to have in mind! Again, I have no particular objection to the spelling "Love's Labors Lost" (which incidentally receives support from the first edition); but the evidence clearly indicates "Labour's" (or if you will "Labor's"), which is the form generally recognized, at least in this country.

I am not certain that this book has ever received the recognition it deserves. Sidney Lee acquired some reputation from his laborious census of copies of the First Folio, and it is familiar to many who have hardly heard of the parallel and incomparably more important work of Miss Bartlett and Mr. Pollard. The one is a list of copies of a single book of no particular rarity, and its allure must have been chiefly for minds like Mr. Folger's when engaged on his fantastic task of collecting between seventy and eighty (isn't it?) copies and fragments of the book. The present *Census* covers eighty-five different editions and "issues" (including important variants), of which about a quarter are of primary importance and many of great rarity. This renders it indispensable to everyone who is engaged either on the editing or on any intensive study of Shakespeare's text. It is true that a part of its appeal lies rather in the direction of collectors and booksellers, but it would be unfair and unfortunate if on that account it failed to be recognized as a work of scholarship and as possessing a very direct appeal to scholars.

W. W. GREG.



**England's Eliza.** By ELKIN CALHOUN WILSON. (Harvard Studies in English, Vol. XX.) Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press ; London : Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xii + 479. \$5.00 ; 21s. net.

THE limits within which this study proceeds are indicated by a prefatory quotation from Fuller : " We intermeddle not with her description as she was a Sovereign Prince. . . ." The object of the book is to illustrate, by copious citation from a wide range of first-hand material, the different facets of the Elizabeth-Image or Myth built up by contemporary writers. This purpose is kept before the mind by arranging the chapters under a series of quasi-mythological synonyms for " Eliza," which is both the title of the whole myth-complex and the " facet-name " of the dramatists' contribution. These chapters record a largely chronological development towards complication and elaboration. Thus, the simple Biblical fervour of delivered Protestants, acclaiming their " Judith " in the broadsides, leads, *via* the " Deborah " of the progresses and the " Eliza " of the stage, to the " Elisa " of the pastoralists and then merges into a kaleidoscopic sequence of " Diana," " Cynthia," " Laura," and " Gloriana." No rigid lines of demarcation can be drawn here ; these titles may denote functions of the Image (" Cynthia," the Lady of the Sea), or appropriate emanations from poetic *genres* (the " Laura " of the Petrarchists) or they may take colour and shape from the spirit and art of individual poets (thus Spenser is the chief, though not the only, begetter of Gloriana).

Mr. Wilson has spared no pains to make his illustrations equal to the amplitude of his theme. Citations are so copious that some sections amount to anthologies of their material (*e.g.* Ch. VIII, " Gloriana "); Ch. IX (*In Memoriam*) is in fact an anthology of elegies and obsequies. Footnotes offer references to further supplementary material and some are concise bibliographies in themselves. An appendix of titles of books and MSS. dedicated, inscribed, or presented to Elizabeth, occupies 44 pages. There are facsimiles and reproductions of portraits and paintings. What patient scholarship, reinforced by a determination to find some harmony or pattern in the mass of material, can do for the Image " Eliza " has here been done.

Certain major difficulties face anyone whose subject is only indirectly related to reality. For all the accumulation of testimony,



the substance may remain thin and unrewarding. It acquires extension but not depth. Further, Reality has a habit of breaking through. It becomes a nice question to decide how far the Image requires the Substance for its elucidation. If Elizabeth is allowed to encroach on "Eliza" the book falters in its purely literary intention and risks poaching on ground already admirably covered by such works as Professor Neale's *Queen Elizabeth*. Mr. Wilson is aware of this problem, but it is inevitable that some of his topics will be more securely fenced than others against the "modern" critical spirit and the more commonplace imp of irreverence. In some contexts a certain freshness of apprehension follows a tactful rationing of the real. "Diana"—the "myth" corresponding to the revival of chivalry—seems well suited to Mr. Wilson's purposes; "Cynthia" much less so.

The question, however, obtrudes itself: what of larger literary significance and stimulus emerges from citation and discussion of compliment upon adulation? The book illustrates, without deliberate shaping to that end, the very remarkable burgeoning and complication that took place about 1580. This is well-enough known, no doubt, but it takes a liberal selection of excerpts from commonplace as well as better writers to demonstrate the revolutionary pace of technical advance and elaboration of "disguising," of pattern and device. The symptoms of the next great turning-point (in the mid-nineties), however, barely show in the material.<sup>1</sup> They scarcely can, *ex hypothesi*, for "Eliza" necessarily stands for the integration of Elizabethan loyalties, hopes and ambitions. It is, therefore, an inevitable consequence of the subject and scheme that the literary impression must remain one-sided and criticism be overweighted by exposition.

In a survey of such range there must be inequalities in the working-out, of which only a few, differing in weight and type, can be pointed out here. It is perhaps a result of the sub-division into aspects that the achievement of Lyly, so finished a myth-maker, lacks distinctiveness of impression. Generous citation follows from the plan, but many quotations need not have been so long (e.g. four pages from *Euphues* on pp. 234-8). There are some unduly rotund and otiose sentences (e.g. p. 303: "But of course Cynthia and Elisa are only different names for the same Tudor rose") and some obscure or debatable assertions. I write here subject to

<sup>1</sup> Some are briefly touched on by Mr. Wilson in his "Retrospect."

correction by historians, but I suspect that some modern myth-making has been added to the Elizabethan in the too easy reference to "consciousness of empire," "symbols of English glory by land and sea," and to Elizabeth's co-operation with her sea-dogs, not to singe (profitably) the King of Spain's beard, but to "form the concept of Cynthia." I have noted a very few misprints or errors in transcription (*e.g.* *Gorboduc* twice on p. 101). The book on the whole is very well produced.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

**Malone Society Reprints.** General Editor, W. W. GREG.

**If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody.** Part I. Pp. xl + 4 leaves of facsimiles + [56]. 1934 (1935). Part II. Pp. lii + 3 leaves of facsimiles + [80]. 1934 (1935).

**Roister Doister.** Pp. xvi + 2 leaves of facsimiles + [68]. 1934 (1935).

**The Soddered Citizen.** Pp. xxviii + 6 leaves of facsimiles + [112]. 1935 (1936).

**John of Bordeaux Or The Second Part of Friar Bacon.** Pp. xvi + 4 leaves of facsimiles + [56]. 1935 (1936).

**An Humorous Day's Mirth, 1599.** Pp. xvi + 2 leaves of facsimiles + [66]. 1937 (1938).

**Charlemagne Or The Distracted Emperor.** Pp. xii + 4 leaves of facsimiles + [102]. 1937 (1938).

*ROISTER DOISTER* (prepared under the direction of Dr. Greg) and *An Humorous Day's Mirth* (prepared under the direction of Dr. Greg with assistance from Professor Nichol Smith) have presented few problems. The first is here reprinted practically *literatim* from the only extant copy (preserved at Eton) of what is probably the first edition. The introduction argues the date of composition, the date of printing, and Udall's authorship (noting that, since the final prayer applies to Elizabeth rather than to Mary, the play in its extant form cannot be wholly as Udall left it). The second is a reprint of a play of which copies of the first edition are "not very rare." The Garrick copy has been chosen as basis, its doubtful readings having been ascertained by reference to other copies.

The final half-sheet (sig. H) of the Garrick copy shows a setting of type different from the other copies: an appendix reprints their text.

*If You Know Not Me*, on the other hand, has engaged Dr. Madeleine Doran (in consultation with Dr. Greg) in an exacting task, which she has performed with thoroughness and a clear head. She has traced the interesting history of her texts through the 8 and 4 editions respectively. On the major problems her discoveries have mainly negative value; even the problem of stenographical piracy, stated as a fact by the author twenty or thirty years after the event, is impossible of solution "in the absence of a good text for comparison":

It is possible that the most we can legitimately and with certainty infer from the words of the prologue<sup>1</sup> is (1) that the play had been pirated, and (2) that shorthand was known to have been employed in similar cases; and that to combine the two propositions into a single statement, as Heywood does, is to go beyond the actual facts of the case (p. xvii).

(Dr. Doran's conclusions are more weighty in view of her thesis concerning *Lear*.) She theoretically reconstructs the history of the two parts of the play, setting out the evidence and leaving the way open for any one to achieve a more plausible account if he can.

The remaining three plays are all printed from MSS. *John of Bordeaux*—perhaps the work of Greene, and certainly worthy of him—is printed for the first time, by Professor Renwick in consultation with Dr. Greg. The MS., which belongs to the Duke of Northumberland, is a playhouse MS., "a shortened version of a longer text," transcribed probably sometime in 1590-4, and mainly by an uneducated scribe (who may have been working from dictation). Four other hands are distinguishable, including Chettle's, who, presumably at a later date, wrote a short "essential speech omitted in the copy." *Charlemagne*, probably circa 1604, has been printed twice before: by Bullen in 1884, by F. L. Schoell in 1920. It is here printed again, for the first time accurately from the MS., by Mr. J. H. Walter (in consultation with Dr. Greg). Mr.

<sup>1</sup> . . . some by *Stenography*, drew  
The plot: put it in print, scarce one word true.

Is "drew the plot" necessarily the equivalent of "reproduced the words of the play as completely as they could manage"? May it not mean "used stenography as a means of getting the gist of the play moment by moment" (in which case "scarce one word true" would seem less far-fetched)?—G. T.

Walter disputes Schoell's belief that the author was Chapman on behalf of "an amateur—influenced, possibly, by the work of Chapman." The MS. seems to be a fair copy made by the author himself (it is not in Chapman's hand, as Schoell assumed), but again "Four other hands [including that of Sir George Buc] can be traced in the manuscript, making alterations, marginal additions, and cuts." *The Soddered Citizen*, "long known by name and generally ascribed to Shakerley Marmion," came to light only in 1932, when its owner presented it for inspection at the British Museum. The MS., mainly that of a scribe "in close touch with the reviser and probably with the author," has some unusual features—e.g. Gothic script for some headings—all of which are represented as closely as possible in the printing. Among the various hands is that of "Jhon," the "book-keeper" who "revised the MS. of *Believe As You List* . . . , and wrote *Bonduca* . . . and *The Honest Man's Fortune* . . . ." In a run of admirable argument Mr. J. H. P. Pafford, who has collaborated with Dr. Greg, suggests that the author is not Marmion but the John Clavell whose name is twice written on the MS. Mr. Pafford has paid some attention to the style of the verse, but perhaps not enough. The play reads like Marmion's work to an extent which makes a detailed examination desirable.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

**The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach** / *Being the Life and Adventures* / *Of a Nefarious Scoundrel who for three centuries* / *Pursued his Sinister Designs* / *In almost all the Theatres* / *Of the British Isles and America* / The whole comprising / *A History of the Stage*. By R. H. BALL. Princeton : Princeton University Press ; London : Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv + 467. \$5.00 ; 22s. 6d. net.

THE pseudo-archaic title-page of this book may arouse a suspicion that the author has attempted one of those fanciful reconstructions of the past intended for popular consumption. He tells us, indeed, in his Prefatory Remarks that he has employed the device of a "fantastical biography"; and the suggestion of something fantastic is borne out by the chapter-headings: "The Hatching of a Cormorant," "Rustication and Return," "The Lightning Flashes," "Leave Your Home Behind," "Scatter the Leaves," "Light from

the Burning," among others equally quaint. The intention is no doubt to attract a wider circle of readers, especially perhaps those who may look upon stage history as a valley of dry bones.

The work is, in fact, for the most part a detailed study of Philip Massinger's play *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* from the point of view of the theatre. In order to justify the use of the term biography Mr. Ball has laid the emphasis on the numerous impersonations of the leading character, Sir Giles Overreach, and on the lives of the actors concerned. His introductory chapter shows the relationship between the dramatist's creation and real flesh-and-blood extortioner Sir Giles Mompesson, whose life is duly recorded in its historical setting. From time to time in the course of the book the biographical fiction is kept up by the use of figurative language. This attempt at revivifying the person of Sir Giles Overreach sometimes produces strange results, as for example when it is said that he "burst forth in full magnificence in the person of Edmund Kean"; or, "he now found himself, not without some amazement, not only at home in the metropolis but on the verge of being the rage."

The work is divided into two main parts, the first dealing with the productions of the play in Great Britain; the second, rather longer than the first, continuing the story in America. There is a short concluding chapter in which the author attempts to account for the longevity of Sir Giles and the general popularity of the play. Appendices treat of the stage-versions and give a list of performances not noted in the text (it might have been more useful to enter all the known performances here); there is also a "bibliography" of books, periodicals, and articles cited in the text or footnotes; and an index of proper names. Several good theatrical portraits adorn the text. Mr. Ball has made extensive use of numerous sources, outstanding among them being the Harvard Theatre Collection. For the lives of the actors he has depended mainly on well-known authorities, while for details of performances and criticisms he has used contemporary newspapers and other periodicals as well as playbills and standard histories of the stage. He modestly disclaims any pretension to comprehensiveness, confining his attention chiefly to the productions in the larger theatrical centres of Great Britain and America. Inevitably the work is largely a compilation of material accessible to students. In matters of detail some prevalent errors have been corrected, and many fresh sidelights on the stage in both countries bear witness to the author's industry.

By concentrating on one leading character and grouping the presentations under the actors in chronological order in accordance with the dates of their first performances, Mr. Ball has endeavoured to give a unified view not only of the actors but also of the stage. Since almost nothing is known of pre-Restoration productions and since the play was not revived as far as can be ascertained until 1748, the period of stage-history effectively covered in the book is much shorter than might be inferred from the title-page and preface. In this country Sir Giles seems to have been finally abandoned by the professional theatre in 1871, though in the United States he managed to survive until 1923. On this last performance Mr. Ball quotes, not without some misgivings, the headlines from the *Detroit News*: "Play Proves Dull Antique. Massinger's New Way to Pay Old Debts Revived, But Who Knows Why?"

The question can doubtless be answered by many amateur dramatic societies, with whom the play has long been popular and some of whose efforts are described in the book. The appeal of the piece to actors of the old tradition from Garrick to Irving lay in its scope for the grand melodramatic style. It is somewhat surprising that although Garrick was responsible for the revival of the play, there seems to be no evidence of his having acted in any part, as some have supposed. Equally remarkable is the lack of evidence, according to Mr. Ball, that Irving ever took a part, as A. H. Cruickshank had stated in his edition of the play. Of the multitude of actors who did impersonate Sir Giles, pre-eminent are Edmund Kean in this country and Junius Brutus Booth, who held the stage for thirty years in America after some years' experience in England. The record of their numerous performances, and still more those of the lesser actors, must try the patience of the most enthusiastic lover of the stage. It is only in the last Act of the play that the opportunity for "great" acting occurs, and the comments of newspaper critics become extremely monotonous. The effects are continually described as "terrific" or "fearfully impressive"; of the little known McKean Buchanan we learn that his "ebullition of fury approached the awful," while G. V. Brooke conjured up visions of "some incarnate demon, blasted and paralysed at the moment of triumph by the avenging lightning of Providence." Such eulogies lose their force by reiteration, and even seem tame coming as they do after the accounts of Edmund Kean's tremendous performance, which caused one veteran actress to faint upon the



stage, threw ladies in the side-boxes into hysterics, and Lord Byron himself into a convulsive fit. It would be unfair, however, to give the impression that the character of Sir Giles Overreach is merely "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Hazlitt's criticisms alone suffice to keep his memory alive, whilst the fact that for so long a period he ranked with Shakespearian characters as a stage figure bears witness to his vitality.

Whether his career merits so lengthy and detailed a study as the present may be open to question. O'Dell's *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, on which it is largely modelled, enjoyed the immense advantage of infinite variety in the characters and intrinsic interest in the plays themselves. The study of drama from the point of view of the theatre should serve to heighten the understanding and appreciation of the play or plays examined. It was not Mr. Ball's purpose, however, to treat Massinger's play as a work of dramatic art; and his interest in Sir Giles lies mainly in the opportunities presented for exhibiting the qualities of the actors, the tastes of the audiences, and the changing modes of presentation. His book will be of value to students of the theatre, particularly perhaps for the perspectives it affords of the English and American stages from a single viewpoint.

D. M. WALMSLEY.

**Milton: Complete Poetry and Selected Prose.** Edited by E. H. VISIAK. London: The Nonesuch Press. 1938. Pp. xxviii+860. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS is a solid, well-printed book, of convenient size for a big pocket; a book for war and evacuation, also because it will last a very long time as a companion. E. H. Visiak gives us first the complete poetry. Perhaps for a popular edition, too much of the poetry. I admire Milton, this side idolatry, more than anyone else, but I would not have included here p. 451 to p. 532, containing the Psalms in English and the Latin, Greek and Italian poems, nor pp. 753 to 822, containing the translations from the non-English poems. I cannot see the interest of these 150 pages for the ordinary reader; to the scholar, they are welcome, but the scholar can find them elsewhere. The general public finds Milton dull and long enough; why deliberately add to the public grievances? The omission of these 150 pages would make the book much more pocketable, and no literature of real value would have been lost.



In a less practical and more important matter, I do not think that in a mere chronological table, Milton's marriage should have been recorded as 1642, May or June. This is merely an ingenious hypothesis, making Milton's marriage one year earlier than was generally ever supposed until the late John Smart of Glasgow worked it out in 1920, on no evidence at all. Smart told me himself that he would never think of giving publicity to this theory unless he found documentary proof: for instance, in some marriage register. Several writers since, here and in America, have not been so careful, and have constructed a better balanced romance out of their imagination instead of Milton's badly managed marriage plot. Their chief argument is that in May 1643, Milton could not have gone to Oxford because of the King's army, unless he went as a spy for the Parliamentary party. Well, why not? It would give us a plausible reason for his trip to Oxford. A good excuse for the enemy would be the debt to be collected, apparently a very forlorn hope, and a debt, which, besides, was *not* collected. If we begin to construct romances, every one has a right to choose the one he likes best; and I like Milton as a spy: at least then he did do something in the civil war, to assist in which he rushed—so slowly—back from Italy. Also the sonnet he wrote that winter, possibly in November 1642: "Captain or Colonel or knight-at-arms," does not read to me like the sort of sonnet a married man would write. In any case, such a controversial point cannot be taken as settled. The choice in the prose is good, for what there is. I find Mr. Visiak a little stingy: instead of the 150 pages of Latin and Psalms, translations from the autobiographical passages of the *Second Defence*, or from the passages of constructive political theorizing, might have been welcome. Personally, and on the example given by the Americans in Professor Patterson's *The Student's Milton*, I would have liked some passages from the *Treatise of Christian Doctrine* included. Much of *Paradise Lost* is made easier to understand when one knows the *Treatise* a little, and some twenty pages of it would contain the expression of Milton's metaphysical ideas.

But all this is really ungracious. Mr. Visiak and the Nonesuch Press have given us a Milton in one volume which is pleasant to the eye, both inside and outside and solid in transport. It really should be the popular Milton for the next generation or so.

D. SAURAT.

**The Works of John Milton.** Columbia University edition under the general editorship of F. A. PATTERSON. Vol. XVIII (THE UNCOLLECTED WRITINGS, ed. T. O. MABBOTT and J. MILTON FRENCH). New York : Columbia University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1938. Pp. xxii+656. 18 vols. £24 net.

THIS final volume of the great Columbia edition is a veritable treasure house, containing "many things new and old." Here are Milton's *Commonplace book* with additions, *Apothegmata and records of conversations*, Mylius' *Tagebuch* and even Milton's horoscope, among many other rare and curious things. For the true lover of Milton, this volume of anecdotes, since it cannot be had alone, is sufficient reason for buying the complete edition. *Outlines for Tragedies* must be read to be believed, thus :

"Brightrick of West Saxons poyson'd by his wife Ethelburga Offa's daughter who dyes miserably also in beggery after adultery in an nunnery Speed in Bithric."

Five acts could not achieve more than these three lines.

Homage should be paid to Frank Allen Patterson and his team of editors for their magnificent effort. It has taken them the whole interval between the two wars to give the world its only complete Milton. Perhaps the scholars of the future will find plenty of subjects for criticism, but it is for us to admire and to be thankful. America has truly taken Milton to its heart. No doubt he went over with the Pilgrim fathers. Now America has given him, in this edition, a proper palace to live in. It is a beautiful edition generously planned, executed with care and scholarship, decorated with taste.

D. SAURAT.

**John Dryden : A Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana.** By HUGH MACDONALD. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. xiv+358. 30s. net.

HUGH MACDONALD's Dryden Bibliography is not only a delight to book-collectors—as it must be to technical bibliographers concerned with problems of seventeenth-century printing—but in addition a most valuable help to any student of Dryden, whether his study be biographical or critical. Collectors and bibliographers specializing in the period will have to go through it thoroughly and hardly need any reviewer's urging to do so. They in particular will appreciate the meticulous research into the make-up of early copies, and the

careful collations, which proceed according to the forms developed in recent years by the Bibliographical Society, especially by its eminent members McKerrow and Greg. They will best understand, too, the judgment and labour which went into the describing of "ideal" rather than actual individual copies of the many editions. They will find on almost every page interesting and original observations. There is, for instance, a thorough and clear account of the different editions of that important series published by Tonson, the first volume of which was entitled *Miscellany Poems*; an account which, for one book-lover at least, sheds much needed light on a previously confusing topic. The explanation on pp. 8-9 of the misplacing of a leaf in Howard's *Poems*, 1660, is interesting; so is the distinguishing of the three separate issues of *Annus Mirabilis*, 1666 (pp. 13-14), with their valuable evidence as to the revision of the text by Dryden; also the identification (partly on the basis of facts noted by Batey) of the actual first edition of *The Wild Gallant*, 1669 (pp. 100-101). These are merely samples of the sort of material that should make the book necessary to specialists on its subject.

But it would be a great mistake for other students of Dryden to neglect this book, thinking that it concerns only such specialists, for nobody interested in Glorious John's life and work can fail to be enlightened by studying its pages.

Mr. Macdonald has gathered together much information which existed before only in scattered places and was hard for an inquirer to study as a whole. The section on pp. 185-6, which gives information as to all letters by Dryden which are now obtainable, is, since no complete edition of his correspondence yet exists, a most useful source for reference. Then, again, a student interested in Dryden's reputation during his lifetime and the decades following his death will find that Mr. Macdonald's large section of Drydeniana serves in some measure as an allusion-book—selective rather than all-inclusive, to be sure, but full for the years preceding 1700 and illuminating throughout. Occasional Drydeniana appear in other parts of the volume, and are not indicated by cross-reference in the section with that heading (pp. 34, 69, 75); a slight fault in arrangement which may prove irritating to some who wish to follow allusions through a period of years. But such instances are rare. Most valuable of all to the general student, probably, will be the large amount of biographical and critical data which appear in the notes and comments

to Dryden's different works—data which go far beyond the usual scope of a bibliography, and which are a material help to students who wish to bring their knowledge up to date. Mr. Macdonald's statement that we do not know enough about Dryden's life to warrant the production of another serious biography may or may not be justified; but if it is, the material in this book is all the more useful because unlikely to be included in a more strictly biographical work. Much of the biographical material is, of course, not original with Mr. Macdonald; but to have so many references and facts collected together in one volume and related to the works they concern is valuable indeed. Besides being a bibliography of early editions and an allusion-book, the volume can justly be said to serve as an adequate and easily consulted handbook to recent biographical and critical work centering on Dryden's writings.

Mr. Macdonald's bibliographical research in itself frequently sheds light on Dryden's life and reputation. A reader going over the editions of the stanzas on Cromwell, as they are listed and explained here, is impressed afresh with the manner in which this early poem was thrown in Dryden's face time after time during later years by his various enemies. The reader will also find on pp. 137-40, in connection with Dryden's prologues addressed to the University of Oxford, interesting inferences of Mr. Macdonald's own as well as the usual detailed set of references to the work of other scholars.

The volume is not entirely without faults. Some readers may regret that after consulting so many copies of various rare books Mr. Macdonald did not see fit to be more specific and complete in regard to their locations. Even when copies are obtainable at the British Museum or the Bodleian, many readers would like to be sure whether they are in one, the other, or both. The other points at which this reviewer can cavil are minutiae—here a slight misprint (p. 225, note 3), there a too dogmatic statement without cited evidence (p. 83), an incomplete reference (*A Dryden Library* is referred to on p. 1, but is not connected with its author, T. J. Wise, until p. 21), and rare and slight obscurities in phrasing (p. 172, note 3). Considering the nature of the work, in which perfect accuracy is an ideal rather than a humanly attainable goal, the flaws in the book are negligible and the virtues great indeed. Mr. Macdonald has certainly won for himself a secure and permanent place among the authorities on the life and works of John Dryden.

G. R. POTTER.

**Defoe.** By JAMES SUTHERLAND. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1937. Pp. xvi+300. 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR SUTHERLAND's biography is a book to delight the lover of Defoe. It is clearly planned to lay emphasis on the major periods of Defoe's life; it is eminently readable; it holds the scales evenly between admirers and detractors; and it makes use of the latest scholarship in the field. Professor Sutherland's own contribution has been very considerable: he prints an interesting manuscript on the Dissenters (hitherto unpublished and unassigned) which is certainly Defoe's, and he incorporates the result of his own legal researches which have thrown light on the earlier career and have given the first explanation of Defoe's mysterious exile from home in his old age. Avoiding the vexed questions of the canon of Defoe's writings, Professor Sutherland has devoted himself primarily to an interpretation of the author's mind and motives. The limitations which he has imposed upon his volume have been justified by the result; he has given in compact form the sanest interpretation of Defoe which has yet been published.

The list of Defoe's biographers is a long one, extending for nearly two centuries. Even though no women with Latin names of endearment influenced his life, Defoe has been studied more than most of his contemporaries. He has been spared the tender mercies of the psycho-analysts who have been at work upon Swift, but he has loomed much larger than his rival in the pages of recent historians. Nor is it only by a single masterpiece that he has managed to charm readers of every description, from Cotton Mather to Rousseau and from Benjamin Franklin to Daudet.

Biographical difficulties have been due not to lack of interest, as has been alleged recently, but to lack of information, lack of an established canon of his works, and the various prejudices of most of his biographers. During four reigns Defoe was a public servant, and yet in some respects we know as little of his life as we do of Shakespeare's. The canon of his writings has been successively enlarged until it approaches four hundred titles, but no competent student of the subject supposes that the list has been completed. Above all, previous biographers have not been content to treat Defoe as journalist and man of affairs. To Wilson and Lee and Chadwick he was a political liberal or a Protestant hero, to Minto he was a liar, to Trent he was a well-intentioned man whose moral fibre was

broken by persecution, to Wright he was a living counterpart of the allegorical Robinson Crusoe, to Dottin he was that incomprehensible human being—a man who was neither Frenchman nor Catholic.

Professor Sutherland stands almost alone among Defoe's biographers for his fairness. He has been content to treat Defoe as "a true-born Englishman," and he prefaces the book with a quotation which summarizes his estimate of his subject :

A Creature not too bright or good  
For human nature's daily food.

On the whole, the book seems to be as painstaking in its details as it is fair in its estimates. One date (p. 92) should read 11 July instead of 11 June, and two footnote references are numbered 43. Professor Sutherland has allowed himself to give too much space to one mare's nest—the old libel, revived by M. Dottin, that Benjamin Norton Defoe was an illegitimate son by an oyster-woman. As he says of this moribund fiction,

This story, anxiously suppressed or indignantly repudiated by earlier biographers, has to-day been dragged into the light. The stone which the nineteenth-century builders rejected so firmly has become the head of the corner.

Professor Sutherland remarks that the facts prove nothing, but some circumstances seem to him suspicious : that Benjamin means "child of sorrow"; that a middle-class child should have two Christian names; and that the taunt was never denied. Defoe's second son, a legitimate child whose identity is well established, was named Benjamin; there is no evidence that Defoe had another son by the same name. A London directory of tradesmen shows clearly enough that middle names were not so uncommon among Benjamin's contemporaries; and Norton—which appears in Luttrell's pages as the name of a prominent Dissenter and also of a tallow-chandler (like Defoe's father in his earlier years)—might have been given to Defoe's son in compliment to a friend or a fellow-religionist. Defoe did not answer Pope's erroneous statement that he had lost his ears in the pillory; he was an old man of nearly seventy and he had out-lived any pleasure in personal controversy. We know too little about Benjamin to hazard any opinion about his response to the libel.

Perhaps it is only fair that an age which has given Wordsworth a French daughter should give Defoe a Billingsgate son. However,



the implication rests on nothing but a malicious story by Richard Savage—who could not tell the truth about his own parentage; and it was repeated by Pope to give point to one of the wittier couplets in *The Dunciad*:

Norton, from Daniel and Ostrœa sprung,  
Blessed with his father's front, and mother's tongue . . .

There is no reason to suppose that Pope believed his own jest, any more than he believed his own description of Defoe as "earless."

For some thirty years Defoe had invited attack on his personal morals. His enemies were shrewd enough to discover any scandal, and resentful enough to present even suspicions as discoveries. For seven years Benjamin Norton Defoe had been known as a journalist, and his father had been at some pains to keep him out of difficulties; never until 1728 did there appear any suggestion that he was illegitimate. The point of Savage's libel was that Defoe's son was notorious for scurrilous writings. Pope raised the jest to literature. But the jest belongs in *The Dunciad*, not in such a discriminating biography.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE.

**Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies.** By JOHN ROBERT MOORE. (Indiana University Publications: Humanities Series No. 1.) Bloomington: Indiana University. 1939. Pp. xii + 249. \$2.

THIS volume is the work of one whose interest in Defoe seems, from the confession of the Preface, to have begun at the age of eight and to have continued with increasing possessiveness ever since. The studies here presented are but a first, though ample, instalment of the products of some fifteen years of concentrated study of Defoe. Professor Moore is to be commended for not having allowed his enthusiasm to warp his judgment and sense of proportion. This miscellany, it is true, is not for all tastes. One suspects that its contents, all of the kind which are normally discreetly distributed over a number of years and a variety of learned periodicals, are here released to clear the ground for a more coherent critical study of Defoe. But, though encumbered by documentation, parallel passages, and the other necessary evils attendant upon arguing controversial hypotheses and disputed attributions, they are all relieved



by the author's constant awareness that it is Defoe the romancer, the "poetic dreamer," the man of letters who really matters. The reader who conscientiously declines Professor Moore's handsome invitation, "If you have only thirty minutes to give to this book, read the Epilogue and the Synopsis to each chapter," will be rewarded by a good deal of interesting illustration and incidental criticism of Defoe's literary methods.

The gist of the major articles may be usefully given. In "Defoe in the Pillory" it is suggested that the ferocity of Defoe's prosecution and sentence in 1703 for having published *The Shortest Way with Dissenters* was not dictated by a desire to make the punishment fit the crime, but by the personal resentment of his judges at the scathing satire to which Defoe had subjected the public and private vices of several of them; for example, of Sir Salathiel Lovell, Recorder of London, in the verse satire, *Reformation of Manners* (1702). Certainly the passages here quoted were not likely to predispose Defoe's judges in his favour. In "Whitney's Horses" Professor Moore explains the point of an obscure allusion to Lovell in *A Hymn to the Pillory* and corrects a misinterpretation of the passage in *More Reformation* where Defoe expresses his indignation at being refused the comforts of religion in Newgate by "three petition'd Priests." A short discussion of "Two Sources for Defoe's *Roxana*" is chiefly interesting for its illustration of Defoe's imaginative use of factual details.

The remaining three-quarters of the volume is devoted to studies in the canon of Defoe's writings. In "Defoe's First Collected Works" Professor Moore argues from sound bibliographical evidence that the so-called "spurious" collection of 1703 was as authentic as the "true" collection of that year, and that Defoe must therefore be given two tracts of which most critics relieve him, namely *A Dialogue between a Dissenter and the Observer* and *Lex Talionis*. Although these additions are of no great moment, the rehabilitation of the "spurious" edition is important. Professor Moore, however, redresses the balance by showing that the 1710 edition is not, as is usually held, the third authorized edition of the collected works, but merely "a re-issue of the unsold sheets of the 1705 edition, with new title-pages and a key to the characters."

Professor Moore's other attributions to Defoe are of considerable importance. They are made, not on bibliographical evidence, but on the strength of his diagnosis in the reclaimed works of what he

feels to be distinctively Defoeian qualities of style, language, material, treatment, etc. Such internal evidence never commands universal assent; but Professor Moore argues soberly from a close familiarity with Defoe's accepted writings, and his conclusions seem reasonable.

The first of these conclusions is that the few original chapters in *The Voyage of Don Manuel Gonzales* (1745), a detailed description of England, were written by Defoe at about the same time as his *Tour* and in much the same spirit, and that after his death his contribution of some 30,000 words was supplemented by a further 170,000 words from the pen of a hack who borrowed unblushingly from a variety of sources. Secondly, Professor Moore adduces strong internal evidence in support of previous critics who have suspected that *Madagascar; or, Robert Drury's Journal* (1729) is not an authentic journal but a romantic fiction by Defoe, based ultimately on a news item of 1705 and elaborated in the style and manner familiarized in *Robinson Crusoe*. Thirdly, and most important of all, he claims for Defoe *A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates*, first published in 1724 as by an unidentified "Captain Charles Johnson" and increased to twice its original bulk by the fourth edition of 1726. Professor Moore describes it as not a compilation, but "an original work of history, interspersed with a good many passages of historical fiction and with some of unrestrained romance," and he believes that, frequently reprinted and translated as it was, it has done more than any other work to form "the modern conception of pirates." As his arguments leave little doubt that his attribution is correct, Professor Moore has secured for Defoe a work not inferior in interest and influence to the *Tour*. Moreover, the addition of this and of *Robert Drury's Journal* to the acknowledged works of Defoe's later years makes it clear that, with increasing age, there was no diminution of the industry which had characterized the prime of this extraordinarily fertile writer.

Professor Moore's volume is appropriately rounded off with an appendix in which is reprinted a rare pamphlet entitled *A Letter from Scotland to a Friend in London* (1705). This also has not been previously assigned to Defoe. Unlike the other attributions, however, it is brief enough to be given in full, and the evidence is there for all to judge.

F. E. BUDD.

**Mr. Cibber of Drury Lane.** By R. H. BARKER. New York : Columbia University Press ; London : Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. viii+278. 19s. net.

THIS is a book which may be read with profit and pleasure. If Cibber can lay no claim to greatness, it is unlikely that he will ever be completely forgotten. He epitomizes the theatre which intervened between that of Betterton and that of Garrick, and wrote for it one of its best comedies. His garish personality was as conspicuous off the stage as on it, and in consequence he became an unavoidably public figure. To read about him is to learn more about the age in which he lived.

Mr. Barker's book supplies almost all that we could desire. In the first place it is a fully documented study of Cibber's career, and the first study which can be so described. Mr. Barker has not only drawn upon the obvious printed sources, such as Davies's *Dramatic Miscellanies* and Victor's *History of the Theatres*, he has also made ample use of the Burney newspapers and the Public Records to establish and to colour the details of Cibber's career as an actor and as an actor-manager. This is perhaps no more than we ought to expect. But where Mr. Barker excels is in the arrangement of his material. He has a good sense of perspective. He knows how much relative attention to pay to Cibber's plays, his activity as a manager, his laureate duties, and his quarrels with Pope and Fielding. His only failure is in his treatment of Cibber's histrionic criticism. Mr. Barker recognizes its quality, but a reader might well wish to know whether Cibber's ability was exceptional at the time and whether Cibber's impressions of the Restoration actors tally with those of other observers.

Mr. Barker is sometimes more positive about the authorship of certain pieces than he should be. A shade of doubt ought usually to cover reference to epigrams in the *Grub Street Journal* which have been ascribed to Pope, but there is less need for caution in referring to the authorship of the *Lives of the Poets* (1753), which both the publisher and Mr. Barker have ascribed to Theophilus Cibber. The matter was cleared up thirty years ago by Professor Nichol Smith (see Raleigh, *Six Essays on Johnson*, pp. 120 ff.). It appears that the whole work was written by Robert Shiels, except for three lives, none of which was written by Cibber. His part was purely editorial.

In spite of the title, the reader will find nothing precious in Mr. Barker's style. It is clear and lively and quite free from the frippery of facetiously antique decoration.

JOHN BUTT.

**Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain.** By JAMES A. S. McPEEK. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. XV.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Pp. xviii + 411. \$5; 21s. net.

THIS book is an exhaustive study of the influence of Catullus in English poetry from the beginning through the age of Pope. While the text is necessarily occupied with detail, the author relegates so much miscellaneous data to the 132 pages of learned notes that he is able to marshal his main material in eight chapters on fairly definite topics, from the epyllion of Peleus and Thetis to translations. The book gathers up previous contributions, large and small, with scholarly completeness, and adds a great deal; so that it is, among other things, an encyclopædic work of reference. The task of tracing Catullan themes, motives, and phrases is complicated by the fact that these had already been imitated by ancient and modern poets, from Ovid to Johannes Secundus, of whom some were more familiar to English writers. While everyone knew Ovid, Horace, and others from childhood, Catullus was a comparative late-comer on the English scene and lacked the official standing and protective colouring long since acquired by classical authors read in school; the first edition printed in England was that of Vossius (1684), and the first text edited by an Englishman appeared in 1702.

The bulk of Professor McPeck's work is concerned with the earlier seventeenth century. Not only was Catullus a late-comer, he arrived at a time when puritan anti-paganism was increasing in volume and shrillness and when in poetry metaphysical complexity and rhetorical formalism did not altogether favour transparent simplicity and directness. In the province of hostile epigram other ancient masters held sway, and only a few of Catullus's satirical pieces were echoed; his main influence of course was on the lyrical and amatory side. The chief writers in the imitative tradition whom Professor McPeck discusses are Skelton, Sidney, Spenser, Campion, Jonson, Herrick, Randolph, Cartwright, and Crashaw. In a number of these the discernible Catullan element is slight; the conspicuous

debtors are Campion and Jonson. Other poets, not so directly imitative but related in various ways to Catullus or the Catullan tradition, are Shakespeare, Donne, Lovelace, Cowley, Marvell, and Pope. Particular themes, like epithalamia, bring in, besides some of the poets named already, such others as Chapman. Among men who made literal translations of a number of poems, the first in point of time and quantity was Lovelace. It may be added that of prose writers who quote Catullus Burton ranks easily first. Professor McPeck, though warmly devoted to Catullus, does not let his enthusiasm run amuck and make him attribute all possible echoes and imitations to his chosen poet. His minute knowledge of the ancients and of Continental poets of the Renaissance is applied with discriminating alertness, and in some notable cases leads to subtraction from rather than addition to what may be called the Catullan canon in English poetry. For instance, he doubts if the *Phyllis Sparowe* of one who styled himself the British Catullus was immediately suggested by Catullus, and in a detailed examination of Spenser's *Epithalamion* he argues for the predominant influence of Marc-Claude de Buttet; in Herrick he sees less of Catullus than literary history has frequently assumed, and regards the Catullan strain as partly direct and partly Jonsonian.

Professor McPeck performs his work with admirable thoroughness and with a sense of poetic values. One may wish perhaps that he had concluded by drawing together his many threads and *aperçus* into a general estimate of the influence of Catullus in a great age of heterogeneous lyric poetry. Certainly one hopes that so well-equipped a scholar will carry the story down through the modern period.

DOUGLAS BUSH.

### Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library.

Compiled by DUGALD MACMILLAN. [Huntington Library Lists, No. 4.] San Marino, California. 1939. Pp. xvi+442.

THERE has always been some uncertainty as to the distinction between public documents and private papers, and high public officials on going out of office have been allowed without demur to take with them practically all the written records relating to the business they transacted in their public capacity. Very often there was no one to question the action, and just as often no one cared.

But as a result there are some surprising gaps amongst the State Papers, and one may well ask how the Larpent plays found a home in California instead of the Public Record Office.

John Larpent was appointed Examiner of Plays under the Lord Chamberlain in 1778, and he held office until his death in 1824. After his death his widow retained possession not merely of all the copies of plays deposited with her husband as licenser, but of all those which had been submitted since the creation of the Examiner's office by the Licensing Act of 1737. About 1832 Collier and his friend Thomas Amyot bought the collection for £400, but the purchase gave Collier little satisfaction, and he eventually unloaded the plays on his patron, the Earl of Ellesmere. With the rest of the Bridgewater House collection they were bought by the late Henry E. Huntington in 1917.

Besides plays the collection includes operatic librettos, songs, addresses, prologues and epilogues, and altogether the catalogue contains over 2,500 items. Information as to its contents has been available for some years in a typewritten check-list deposited in a few libraries, but Professor MacMillan's catalogue presents in an accessible form a great deal of information that has not been available before. In his preface he modestly says: "The principal task of the compilers was to identify the plays; although authors' names had to be found and an astonishing number of changed titles was encountered, a greater measure of success was achieved than had been originally anticipated." The unidentified items—mostly prologues, epilogues, and addresses—are only just over a hundred in number.

The collection contains an almost complete record of nearly a century of English drama, and its importance to the dramatic historian of the period cannot be overestimated. Only the specialist, it is true, will be interested in the careers of such prolific nonentities as John O'Keeffe, James Robinson Planché, and Isaac Pocock, but the catalogue will be consulted by many besides those interested in the minor figures of eighteenth and early nineteenth century drama. The collection throws some interesting light on the later reputation and influence of the Elizabethan and Restoration dramatists, and future editors of Johnson, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Lamb, Coleridge, and Byron will all find in it at least one item that they cannot afford to ignore.

The most important parts of the catalogue entries indicate



whether the play is printed or manuscript, for occasionally a printed copy was deposited with the Examiner; they give the date of application for a licence (if the application has survived) and the theatre from which the application came; brief notes draw attention to changes in title and to the results of a comparison of the manuscript with a printed version of the play, where there is one. "The almost complete success of this last endeavor," states the Preface, "has been made possible by the presence under the same roof of both the Larpent manuscripts and the Kemble-Devonshire plays."

Occasionally, as in the case of some of O'Keeffe's plays, it has not been possible to make a comparison with the first edition of the printed version, but the remarkable thing is that it was possible so often. A minor blemish is that the indexing ought to have been fuller; for instance, in the index of authors there is only one entry under Sir Walter Scott, a fact which gives no clue to the frequency of stage adaptations of the Waverley novels. There is a slip in item 2484, where what seems to be an epilogue is described as a prologue, but, as a whole, the book represents the successful performance, with conscientious care and skill, of a difficult and tedious, but exceedingly important, task.

R. C. BALD.

**The Poetical Works of John Keats.** Edited by H. W. GARROD.  
Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. xc+572.  
30s. net.

As editor of a poet's text Professor Garrod sets a standard of perfection, and his noble edition of Keats is as complete and as accurate as mortal man could make it. He has collated every available manuscript and all the printed texts that matter, and has recorded with inexhaustible patience, and a nearly infallible accuracy every variant, however slight, and every word that Keats wrote and cancelled in the process of composition. All students of Keats stand deeply in his debt: the work that he has done need never be done again; his introduction and *apparatus criticus* make accessible in the clearest possible form every fact that we can want to know about the early editions and the manuscripts.

His arrangement of the poems seems undoubtedly the best. Amongst his reference to other editors in his introduction there is, by the way, none to Professor de Selincourt, whose great edition



of Keats he inevitably knows well. Professor Garrod prints in order of their appearance the three volumes, of 1817, 1818 and 1820, published by Keats in his lifetime; then the *Literary Remains* of 1848 (Milnes's second volume), followed by the poems scattered up and down the *Memoir* (Milnes's first volume). After this the *Fall of Hyperion* from Woodhouse's manuscript, and finally posthumous pieces, serious and trivial. Some will wish that the pieces in the final section, *Trivia*, of which the last two are mere schoolboy jests, had either been omitted or printed in smaller type. But Professor Garrod's aim has been completeness.

His principle in compiling the *apparatus criticus* is frankly to eschew selection, to give everything. Keats was a singularly erratic speller. But most of his errors are rather slips of the pen than positive spellings or mis-spellings, and their inclusion in the *apparatus criticus* gives them often a quite misleading significance. Thus "sweel" given as MS. variant for "swell" (*Eve of St. Agnes*, 206) evokes at first blush the query: is Keats trying a dialect word "sweal"? But as soon as we reflect, we know that he was simply failing to lift his first *l* stroke high enough: he really wrote a careless "swell." Again "palent" given as MS. variant for "patient" (*Ode to Autumn*, 182) is a bit of slovenly writing: like the rest of us he sometimes fails to cross a *t*, and here he also omits to make a minim stroke. The letter *i* is one that he is apt to omit: (cf. "quckly," *Eve of St. Agnes*, 21). The letter *r* is conspicuously another: thus in *Ode to a Nightingale* he writes "povençal" (provençal), "clusted" (cluster'd), "veduous" (verdurous), "folorn" (forlorn) recorded as variants; and in *Hyperion* I, 11, "steam" (stream) not recorded. Sometimes he notices the omission: thus in *Hyperion* II, 25, he first writes "scew'd", and then supplies the missing *r* above. So commonly does he omit the letter *r* in rapid script that I incline to look upon his spelling of "folorn" in the crucial passage in the *Ode* as simply a characteristic slip of the pen, without significance for the ear. Professor Garrod's disarming defence of his plan in giving all the variants, significant or insignificant, deserves to be quoted:

If it is pedantic to put these variants into an *apparatus criticus*, it is perhaps more pedantic not to find them interesting. The catalogue of them is not scholarship. But it is a venial diversion of scholarship. Indulging it, I have seemed to myself to know Keats better. But why this should be so, I have no idea.

Surely the simple explanation is that in reading with the utmost closeness what a poet wrote with "that warm scribe, his hand," we *must* come nearer to him; for his handwriting is a vital expression of him like the inflections of his voice; and his habits, careless or careful, of writing express something intimate that brings us nearer to himself. For this reason I would submit that a facsimile reproduction in this volume of a few interesting pages of Keats's holograph would be the best way of satisfying the student's curiosity about his habits of writing and spelling; and if this were done the *apparatus criticus* might by the same stroke be lightened of all the ill-written words from his manuscripts which have no interest as variants. The student who wants to know how Keats really wrote a word or a passage must consult with his own eyes the manuscript: nothing short of that will do: even if the editor is scrupulously careful in transcribing, he cannot show us *in print* just what the poet wrote, and, if he could, the printer or the printing press may fail in a letter or a comma. Professor Garrod is a scholar of ripe experience and of the finest discrimination. Our only quarrel with this monumental edition of Keats is that its system precludes him from using these gifts in the way that would be most profitable to the student. We would plead for a method of editing which would allow a scholar such as Professor Garrod to exercise his fine discrimination in the process of selection throughout, so that in his *apparatus criticus* what is significant would be preserved, and the insignificant thrown overboard lest it encumber and obscure. The best that the best editor can give us is the full benefit of his critical judgment.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

Keats. By H. W. GARROD. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.  
1939 (Second Edition). Pp. 155. 5s. net.

THIS volume contains the substance of the lectures on Keats delivered by Professor Garrod from the Chair of Poetry at Oxford, newly revised. To an old pupil of Mr. Garrod it is a matter of high gratification that his tutor should have occupied the position dignified by Keble, Matthew Arnold, and Professor Mackail, and vindicated the standard of severe excellence set forth by them. Professor Garrod says that poetry is worthy of exact study; and his own method of approaching Keats has something of the textual critic editing a classical poet, with a little of the author of *Galileo*. It has a starry

brilliance, and, for aught I know, he thinks otherwise than the Dominicans.

Mr. Garrod's study of Keats may be divided under the following heads : (1) Keats's " life of sensations, not of thoughts " taken to be the pure gospel of the *Lyrical Ballads*—i.e. the insistence of Wordsworth and Coleridge on the value of the senses, as distinct from the eighteenth-century abstractions of the Reason ; (2) Keats was wrong when he desired to turn from sensuous poetry to poetry of a political, humanitarian, or metaphysical character ; (3) *Hyperion*, the epic of the Revolutionary Idea, vitiated by an allegoric scheme and abandoned because the subject was unfortunate and because Dante's influence (in Cary's translation) was in the ascendant over Milton's ; (4) the " Odes," the distinctive work of Keats : their form a variation from the sonnet, with which Keats had experimented and was dissatisfied ; (5) an excursus on Keats's meeting with Coleridge, and the influence of their recorded conversation on Keats's poetry ; (6) an examination of the Sonnets, with a suggested preference of certain among them. A few remarks may be pardoned on the subjects thus tabulated.

With regard to the sensuous character of Keats's poetry, the primary objection is directed not against sensations in themselves, but against the particular nature of those of Keats. It may be true that Wordsworth in his *Lyrical Ballads* was led by a study of Hartley's physiological *Observations* to express in poetry the worlds of eye and ear, and to speculate on his sensory organs. But Wordsworth, largely from his upbringing, was better than his guide and his own purpose. He says elsewhere that, on a walk from Ambleside to Hawkshead, he noticed in youth how many natural objects had failed to receive attention in poetry, and resolved to rectify the defect. Herein we have a Wordsworth more original than the student of Hartley and the philosophy of Locke. And Wordsworth's sensations are much " purer " and more austere than those of Keats. He is, more than most men, a poet of the mountains :

Two Voices are there ; one is of the sea,  
One of the mountains,

he says himself. Now Keats has the sea, but he has not, or has very little, the mountains. He was, of course, by birth a Londoner, and this was his misfortune. As Blake said :

Great things are done when men and mountains meet ;  
This is not done by jostling in the street.

This is the crying defect of Keats : there is too much jostling in the street in him. When he leaves London, he goes also to those languid places Winchester, Oxford, and Shanklin. Keats's sensations, therefore, are not those of Wordsworth, Shelley, or Scott. He is to be reprehended not for sensations but for the sensations of the lowlander.

Secondly, to condemn Keats for aspiring to write metaphysical poetry, or even metaphysics, is unfair. Of the poets of his own day, Wordsworth applied himself to a vast philosophical poem, Coleridge outlined a system of metaphysics, and Shelley also contemplated metaphysical and ethical works. Plato too, in an earlier age, passed from poetry to philosophy. Keats, moreover, died at twenty-six, while forty is assigned by Plato as the proper age for the study of philosophy. If Keats aspired to be another Plato, why should he not ?

That *Hyperion* is the epic of the Revolutionary Idea admits of dispute. It was intended to be of the same length as *Endymion*—that is, four books. This is too short for an epic. Secondly, the epic of the Revolutionary Idea has been written—the *Revolt of Islam*. If Professor Garrod refuses to admit Shelley to his canon, he should say so. Does his devotion to Matthew Arnold imply Arnold's slighting of Shelley ? Incidentally, indeed, a deficiency in Professor Garrod's admirable book is his omission to tell us who the great poets are. We gather that Keats is not one. Apparently Spenser is not. And we learn elsewhere that Wordsworth is not truly great. It would be of interest if Professor Garrod would say outright whether he prefers Shelley or Keats. For myself, I throw down the challenge that Shelley is first of the Romantics.

Mr. Garrod's remarks on the technical character of the Odes are criticism of a stimulating and brilliant order. Like an old Warden of Merton and a proposition of Euclid, if he has not proved his contention, he may be said to have " rendered it exceedingly probable." I would not, however, vouch for its being true, could we find the archetype of the Odes. One remark of Mr. Garrod is perplexing. I cannot see how the " little clan " in the *Ode to Maia* can be " the Miltons and Wordsworths " (p. 44). The " little clan " has its parallel in the " Sherwood-clan " of *Robin Hood*. Just as the poets of the Grecian isles left their verse to their " little clan "—i.e. to the Homeridæ or the simple tribesmen gathered on the sward—so Keats will leave his verse to the primrose and the span of heaven,

content with the worship of a day. Keats cannot mean, I humbly submit, either that the Greeks bequeathed great verse to Milton and Wordsworth or that he himself either bequeaths or relinquishes his verse to them or their kind.

With regard to the Sonnets, it does not appear proper to speak of the octave and sestet of the Shakespearian variety, except for comparison. But Mr. Garrod has written a fascinating study, and the nightingale in high-piping Pehlevi must have sung to him. How else could he know that Keats's nightingale was, *in propria persona*, immortal?

T. E. CASSON.

**Shelley and Other Essays.** By GEORGE H. COWLING. Melbourne University Press, 1936; London: Humphrey Milford, 1937. Pp. 176. 4s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR COWLING made his first appearance as an author in 1913, and since then he has published a number of small treatises designed to help the elementary student or to guide the explorations of the general reader. This is a valuable service, but one which almost precludes originality. It is to be hoped that from now the common task of recording that "Percy Bysshe Shelley was born in 1792," and the daily round of narrative which follows, will be left to less distinguished hands, and that Professor Cowling will come boldly forward and expound his own philosophy of life and letters.

The Preface raises pleasant expectations, for we are told of the essay on Shelley that "for some reason which I do not fully understand, the subject demanded that I should write it." If there are few signs of the inspiration which these words promise the reason seems to be that the writer has only partly freed himself from the trammels of the text-book. For a brief interval he achieves complete emancipation, and with happy results. "Speaking personally," almost for the first time, he examines the *Defence of Poetry* and the essay *On Love* by the rule of common sense, "the inherited experience of mankind," to which he professes unqualified allegiance. "I believe," he says, "in intuition and inspiration, because I believe in God"; but he does not believe either that all poetry is inspired or "that great poetry is the only medium of divine inspiration." Nor can he persuade himself that "love or benevolence or compassion, call it what you will, is, by itself, a cure for all the ills of life. I

admire common sense more." Milton, whose name Shelley frequently invokes, is on the side of Professor Cowling and the angels when he reminds us

That not to know at large of things remote  
From use, obscure and subtle, but to know  
That which before us lies in daily life  
Is the prime wisdom.

The essay on Shelley, which is really a condensed biography, fills about two-thirds of the entire volume. The next essay, on "Shakespearean Comedy," succeeds excellently in communicating the writer's lively interest in his favourite heroes and heroines, but the publishers do it no service by exaggerating its pretensions into "an original attempt to formulate the rules of Comedy as *Shakespeare* conceived them." In "Milton's *Paradise Lost*" and "Virgil in English Poetry" Professor Cowling treads, as usual, familiar paths, but the uninitiated will be grateful for his guidance.

P. L. CARVER.

**Wordsworth and Coleridge.** [Studies in honour of George McLean Harper.] Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. [Various authors.] 1939. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. viii+254. \$4.00; 18s. net.

PROFESSOR HARPER has deserved well of the world of scholarship; if his biography of Wordsworth is not quite in the first flight it is well up in the second, and there is no apparent likelihood of its being superseded for a long time to come. In the volume under notice a number of friends and former students have combined to pay tribute to him, on his retirement from the Wilson Chair of Literature at Princeton, by publishing a baker's dozen of essays on topics connected with Wordsworth and Coleridge and their poetry. There is also a short "appreciation" of Professor Harper by a colleague and a full but badly arranged bibliography of his writings.

Such *Festschriften* generally provide mixed feeding, and the present specimen is no exception, though it has more unity than many of its kind. Only one paper, that on Helen Maria Williams, has no real relationship to the title of the volume; it is a painstaking, heavy-handed effort which unluckily quite misses the tone appropriate to a biographical study of the lively but sentimental and in herself insignificant Miss Williams. Mr. Monk's study of Anna Seward rather unexpectedly proves to be both relevant and interesting.



He attributes her complete failure to enjoy the *Lyrical Ballads*—although she adored Gray and Cowper and admired the more obviously “romantic” poetry of Scott—to her inability to make head or tail of what was really new in the post-1798 poetry, viz. “the subjective approach, which mingled the object with the perceiving mind and in so doing transformed the object.” If not precisely new, this displays old truth in a new light.

Of the remaining essays on critical subjects, that by the late Professor Legouis, though among the shortest, is perhaps the most interesting. It retells with surprising freshness the old story of the birth of the 1798 *Lyrical Ballads*, wisely laying stress on the “residuary Godwinism” discernible not only in “The Female Vagrant” but in “Simon Lee” and even “Tintern Abbey”:

In this condemnation of present society Wordsworth still agrees with Godwin, though he sets his hope of redress on love and charity rather than on the progress of reason. The woes that Godwin tries to cure by appealing to the intellect, Wordsworth strives to alleviate by refining the sense of pity.

There is substance also in Mr. C. D. Thorpe’s careful examination of the precise shades of meaning which Coleridge wished to attach to the word “sublime” as contrasted with “majestic,” “beautiful,” “grand,” and “picturesque.” The illustrations, drawn from a wide range of Coleridge’s prose writings, are particularly useful; but, like most explanations of Coleridge’s explanations, the essay makes rather heavy going.

More ambitious, but less satisfying, are the papers on “Wordsworth’s Conception of the Esthetic Experience” and on “The Tragic Flaw in Wordsworth’s Philosophy.” The former (by Mr. O. J. Campbell) is not happily titled, for it is concerned quite as much with the moral and the spiritual as with the æsthetic, and is, in the main, a kind of defensive elaboration of some points in Mr. W. L. Sperry’s well-known explanation of Wordsworth’s later barrenness as a poet. We arrive at length at the not very enlightening conclusion that:

His early poetry established man’s oneness with Nature and the identification of his spirit with that of his fellow men. His later work revealed man’s personality as possessed of aspirations and powers which emancipated him from the world of eye and ear, and also from his ties with his fellow men. Wordsworth’s political and social conservatism was thus a natural result of his deeply felt independence of all the manifestations of mutability.



Mr. Stallknecht finds the "tragic flaw" of his title in Wordsworth's failure to harmonize the "ideal of self-realization" in *The Prelude* with the "ideal of self-transcending duty" in the *Ode to Duty* and *The Excursion*; he says some interesting things by the way, but tries to cover too much ground and has to take a lot for granted that many readers would be inclined to query.

Most of the other contributions are concerned with biographical matters; only three call for special mention. Professor E. de Selincourt, in his admirably written "Wordsworth and his Daughter's Marriage," throws new light on the relations between the poet and Dora's suitor, Edward Quillinan, and partly exculpates Wordsworth from the charge of selfishness in opposing the marriage. Professor E. J. Morley gives a detailed account, from recently discovered manuscripts, of Coleridge's stay in Germany in 1799. This paper, however, is reprinted from a previous appearance in the lamented *London Mercury*; and in respect of new biographical material the plum of the volume is undoubtedly the second part of the Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge's contribution, "Samuel Taylor Coleridge Discovers the Lake Country." This publishes for the first time (following a much less interesting diary of a tour with Wordsworth in 1799) Coleridge's "Letter-Journal or Journal-Letter" to the Hutchinsons and the Wordsworths, dated August 1-6, 1802, and giving a full and brilliantly vivid account, in his rare best epistolary style, of his ascent (characteristically quite unpremeditated) of Scafell. Apart altogether from its quality as pure description, it shows Coleridge in a new and almost startling light. The late Gordon G. Wordsworth, in a "Note to Coleridge's Ascent of Scafell" (printed here at pp. 163-5), tells us: "As far as I know this is by many years the earliest record of the pleasures of rock-scrambling, or of any ascent of the Scafell group for the mere love of the fells." Gordon Wordsworth had every right to express an opinion on this question, and his opinion is most decidedly that as a mountaineer Wordsworth must play second fiddle to his friend. That Coleridge, of all people, should turn out to have the best claim to the title of Pioneer and Patron Saint of Rock-Climbers is one of life's little ironies which may be commended to the attention of his more censorious biographers.

Two small errors of fact may be noticed. On p. 85 Mr. L. N. Broughton is mistaken in assuming that J. H. Reynolds's authorship of the parody *Benjamin the Waggoner* can be taken as proved; and

Mr. E. L. Griggs does some injustice to Hazlitt in attributing to him (on p. 173) the *Edinburgh Review* attack on *Christabel* which, as Mr. P. P. Howe showed long ago, must be substantially Jeffrey's.

R. W. KING.

**Shakespeare in Germany, 1740-1815.** By R. PASCAL.  
London: Cambridge University Press. 1937. Pp. x+199.  
7s. 6d. net.

THIS well-chosen selection of representative passages from German writings on Shakespeare between 1740 and 1815, followed by some brief extracts from various translations of the plays, and prefaced by an historical introduction of thirty-six pages, is a most useful piece of work, although, since it is primarily intended for students of Shakespeare, not all of whom know German, its usefulness would have been increased if the passages chosen had been translated.

The Introduction is sound and scholarly, although, as Professor Wolfgang Keller has already observed in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Professor Pascal's contention, in opposition to Gundolf's *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, that German criticism of Shakespeare merely epitomizes the outlook of successive leaders of German thought, between whom and the theatre-going public there was a vast gulf, is pressed rather too far. The "German spirit" cannot be identified with German taste, any more than the "English spirit" can be identified with English taste. If, during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Shakespeare was adapted and bowdlerized for the German public, his fate in England was not very different. If Goethe, in 1825, told Eckermann that Shakespeare was no dramatic poet, and that he never thought of the stage, which was far too narrow for his great spirit, Coleridge and Lamb were saying much the same kind of thing about his tragedies, and Carlyle, a few years later, was to repeat and emphasize the dictum of Goethe. Moreover, Professor Pascal's statement that when, about 1815, critics no longer disputed over Shakespeare's greatness, he ceased to be a vital factor in German literary history, is hardly reconcilable with Dr. Rainer Schlösser's remark, in the lecture he delivered during the second German Shakespeare Week at Bochum, that, ever since the classical period, the highest ambition of the German dramatist might be described as that of becoming a "German Shakespeare." Account must also be taken of the numerous

attempts to revise and improve the standard translation, and of the fact that, during the last twenty years alone, there have been more than thirty thousand performances of Shakespeare's plays in Germany.

It was during the third quarter of the eighteenth century that the "Saspar" whom, in 1740, Bodmer had only heard of and whose *Julius Cæsar* Gottsched, a year later, treated with contempt, began to conquer Germany, or, as Professor Pascal would prefer to say, the leaders of German thought. Almost all the factors which made this conquest easy were expressed by Lessing in 1759, when he declared that it was a great pity that Shakespeare had not been translated into German instead of Corneille and Racine, since he suited the German taste far better, and might have inspired a German genius; for a genius could only be kindled by a genius, especially one who seemed to owe everything to nature. Professor Pascal has, perhaps, not sufficiently emphasized the nationalistic element in the German admiration for Shakespeare: the Germanic Shakespeare (the word "nordic" had not yet been invented!), Shakespeare, the poet of nature, was to redeem the German spirit from the tyranny of French taste. In fact, by 1809 A. W. Schlegel was declaring that the Germans were the only people who really appreciated Shakespeare: Shakespeare's contemporaries had understood his greatness, but later writers, such as Pope, had been incapable of doing so, and their objections had been repeated by all critics except those of modern Germany. That the French should talk as though Europe had only emerged from barbarism during the reign of Louis XIV was to be expected, but that Englishmen should use such language seemed incomprehensible. And Schlegel, like Coleridge (Professor Pascal has not dealt with the question of Coleridge's possible indebtedness to him), proceeds to demonstrate that not only is Shakespeare's "nature" better than French "art," but more truly artistic. Shakespeare, in fact (and somehow, one feels, Germany too), has it both ways: he is always a profound artist, never a wild, irregular genius. Even his anachronisms were intentional; his historical plays are parts of one great whole—*Here's tae us! Wha's like us?*

J. B. LEISHMAN.

**The History of the English Novel.** By ERNEST A. BAKER.  
London: H. F. & G. Witherby. Vol. X. "Yesterday."  
1939. Pp. 420. 16s. net.

FIFTEEN years ago Professor Baker published the first volume of this *History* with the intention of completing the whole work in two more volumes. Is it with relief, or with regret, that he now speaks of "the end of an enormous task"? Whichever be his meaning he has not fallen by the way nor grown weary at the last; for the final volume is longer than any that went before. Nor is there any sign of jaded enthusiasm for reading fiction in large quantities.

The contents of Professor Baker's earlier volumes came down to him sifted through the mesh of the years; but the novels of yesterday, not less than its events, elbow each other in the crowded thoroughfares, the tinker and the beggarman jostling aside the æsthete and the aristocrat. The press is so thick that the critic must be satisfied who succeeds, as Professor Baker certainly does, in keeping his footing.

The practice of plotting the past by periods has become a commonplace with literary historians—"The Augustan Age," "The Romantic Revolt," and so on. These and the like terms of definition have more meaning and truth when we look at a sufficiently distant prospect, although even then they obscure overlappings and finer shades. Perhaps the movement of history is more a process of "staggered" (to use a modern term) alternations than like a stream flowing through a changing landscape. The sub-titles of Professor Baker's successive volumes tend to accentuate divisions; and, naturally, each volume in a long series seems to mark out a boundary. Save for considerations of bulk and space volume IX, "The Day before Yesterday," and volume X, "Yesterday," would be better within the same covers. And, further, if we are to look at our contemporaries, why should we turn away, save for slanting glances, from the living who were alive yesterday and the day before? A few inclusions would have rounded off the last two volumes. The very young, or the middle-aged, might have been ignored. But there are those alive, who can, beyond a peradventure, be judged to have passed their climacteric, and be assessed in relationship to those who died a few years ago.

This last volume has not taken the form Professor Baker originally intended. It should have begun with Samuel Butler, whose

*Erewhon*, *Erewhon Revisited*, and *The Way of All Flesh*, may fairly be said to have influenced the thought, method, and aim of the purposive English novelists and dramatists, in the earlier half of this century, more than any other works of our time. To instance no lesser examples, it is sufficient to quote Mr. Bernard Shaw's complaint that "when . . . I produce plays in which Butler's extraordinarily fresh, free, and future-piercing suggestions have an obvious share, I am met with nothing but vague cacklings about Ibsen and Nietzsche." Judged by the date of his birth Butler belongs to an earlier generation than Yesterday. *Erewhon* was published nearly seventy years ago; *Erewhon Revisited* and *The Way of All Flesh* are now nearly forty years old, and the last book, although it was not published till after Butler's death, was finished in 1884. But there is ample justification for bringing Butler into this volume. He stands outside the limitations of chronology, belonging to our own time. And Professor Baker writes well, with understanding and insight, about Butler, although the best things he says would have been better had he cultivated brevity, for it must be confessed that as he goes on his way through these volumes the pages often become overloaded. And, further, it is a pity that he could not cling to his original purpose in the design of this volume. It has fallen out of shape by beginning with three chapters in which Conrad and Rudyard Kipling fill the foreground, followed by two miscellaneous chapters, before we reach Butler and his legacy.

Then come Arnold Bennett and Galsworthy, whose limitations, as well as gifts, are not difficult to note. Professor Baker deals faithfully with both. The distinctive characteristics of the two are well stated: "In one, eager curiosity, unerring vision, and the faculty of exact and lifelike registration: analysis, generalization, theory, and criticism, in the other." And it is an apt comment on Galsworthy, that "he lingers at the funeral of Victorianism like an uninvited mourner, whose grief is more sincere than that of the family, because he expects no legacy."

Professor Baker brings his story abruptly to an end with the death of D. H. Lawrence ten years ago. And he refrains cautiously from any attempt to summarize his conclusions at the end of his long journey. The English novel, like the English character, is marked by independence and individuality. It cannot, save by strain and artifice, be divided into æsthetic segments or schools of

thought. The one conclusion Professor Baker permits himself is "that doctrines and theories have never left anything like the deep impress of the great personalities who have appeared from time to time and changed the direction of fiction."

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**The Place-names of the East Riding of Yorkshire and York.** By A. H. SMITH. (English Place-name Society, Vol. XIV.) London: Cambridge University Press. 1937. Pp. lx+351. 18s. net.

Most readers will turn at once to the most interesting name in the book, that of York itself, which enshrines within its four letters a miniature history of the city. A Celtic \**Eboracon* was Latinized as *Eboracum*. A combination of phonetic change and popular etymology turned this into the Saxon *Eosforwic* "boar village," and this, in the mouths of Scandinavian settlers, became *Jórvík* and *Jórk*, and so to the modern York which occurs already in the thirteenth century. This name, too, illustrates Dr. Smith's characteristic caution and independence. For its original source, he hesitates between a Celtic personal-name *Eburos* and the common British noun *eburos* ("yew-tree").

The very full account of the street-names of York (20 pp.) further illustrates the history of the city. Most of them are compounded with the old Scandinavian *gata* "street" or *geil* "a narrow passage between houses." Old English words are rare, even as first elements and where the OE *lane* occurs, it is usually a late substitute for *geil* or *gata*. The mediæval trades are well represented. Coney Street, "King's street" contained the East Scandinavian *kunung*, whilst Bootham is clearly from West Scandinavian. Patrick's Pool reminds us of the close connection between the Scandinavian Kingdoms of York and Dublin, as also does Jubbergate, originally *Brettegata*, "the street of the Britons," from old Scandinavian *Bretar*, used, it is suggested, of Cumbrian Britons who accompanied the Irish Vikings and, no doubt, were slaves as they were segregated outside the city wall. Some centuries later, after Edward I's expulsion of the Jews from the city, they, too, may have concentrated in this street, which was still outside the wall, and this is reflected in the prefix added to the older name, *Jubretegate*, which later became *Jubertgate* and *Jubergate*. The Jew's quarter was



Jewbury. The whole of this section is of particular value and those interested in street-names will find much further information on those of Beverley, Hull, and Bridlington.

Dr. Smith, in his introduction, takes advantage of his earlier treatment of the place-names of the North Riding to point out similarities and differences between the two ridings. This introduction must be read as a whole, but its chief points are that in the place-names of the East Riding, there is little evidence of British settlement or of a survival of the British population. But many Celtic names may have disappeared, just as it is probable that many Anglian names of early date were replaced or obscured in form or meaning during the Scandinavian settlement. This settlement has left a very considerable impression on the place-names of the East Riding both in the purely Scandinavian names, in hybrids, in the survival of inflectional forms, and in the supplanting of Old English elements by similar or corresponding Scandinavian words or sounds. This tendency to adaptation and substitution often makes it very difficult to decide whether the ultimate origin of a particular name was English or Scandinavian, particularly when both elements may be from either language. It is noteworthy that, where it is possible to distinguish between East and West Scandinavian, the Scandinavian place-names of the East Riding are Danish in origin, and the evidence for any sort of Norwegian influence, such as there is in the North Riding, is negligible.

One striking difference between the East Riding and the more southerly counties of Essex and Warwickshire is revealed. In the latter counties, much light can be thrown on the history of the field-names. In the East Riding there is a paucity of material and a difficulty of equating the early field-names recorded with the modern names surviving. There seems to have been little continuity in the minor nomenclature of the district and the modern field-names are of little interest.

The book ends with the usual lists and valuable indexes, and has also an appendix on *Spēn* in place-names. Dr. Smith's treatment of this riding is fuller and more comprehensive than his earlier book on the North Riding. The largest of the three ridings still awaits him and it is to be hoped that the conclusion of his immense task will not be too long delayed.

P. H. REANEY.



**The British Museum Quarterly.** Vol. XIII, No. 4. December 1939. London: published by the Trustees. 2s. 6d.

THE greater part of this issue is devoted to the Anglo-Saxon antiquities discovered in the summer of 1939 at Sutton Hoo, in Suffolk, and presented to the nation by the owner, Mrs. E. M. Pretty. It is fitting that a generous public expression of gratitude be made, for this "was one of the most magnificent and munificent gifts that the British Museum has ever received as a single acquisition from a donor during his or her lifetime." War broke out a few days after the presentation was made to the Museum. "Fortunately, however, Mrs. Pretty had previously asked the British Museum to take charge of the most valuable objects as they were excavated, and had authorized any preservative measures that were immediately necessary. It is pleasant to record that the Laboratory has thus had time not only to clean one or two items of great importance that urgently needed treatment . . . but also to rescue the most tender perishables, which, in consequence, we have since been able to pack without the grave misgivings we should otherwise have felt."

The following descriptive essays of the Sutton Hoo finds are published in the December 1939 *Quarterly*:

- I. The Discovery, by T. D. Kendrick.
- II. The Gold Ornaments, by T. D. Kendrick.
- III. The Silver, by Ernst Kitzinger.
- IV. The Coins, by Derek Allen.
- V. Other Finds, by T. D. Kendrick.
- VI. Sutton Hoo and Saxon Archæology, by T. D. Kendrick.  
(There are eleven plates illustrating the essays.)

The value of the finds is indicated by the following quotation from the essay on the gold ornaments:

Knowing as we do the vast series of cloisonné jewels made in north-west Europe from the days of Childeric I (d. 481) onwards, we cannot fail to recognize in the maker of the Sutton Hoo purse and clasps one of the greatest of all the innumerable goldsmiths who worked in this technique. Setting aside the matter of the ornamental style of the pieces, which is in the somewhat muddled and too copiously exuberant manner of the beginning of the seventh century, the fact remains that in dexterity and invention the Sutton Hoo master and his lapidary have few equals.

The Quarterly announces the principal recent acquisitions of the Museum, and among the books the following will be of interest to readers of *R.E.S.*

Forty-five works in fifty-six volumes printed on vellum at the Kelm-scott Press by William Morris, most of them containing his autograph note of presentation to Emery Walker, and eleven works in twelve volumes printed on vellum at the Doves Press by T. J. Cobden-Sanderson and Emery Walker.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti. *Poems*, London, 1870—*Poems*, Leipzig, 1873.—*Dante and his Circle*. London, 1874.

Dante. *The New Life*. Translated and illustrated by D. G. Rossetti. London, 1903.

A Collection of Theatre Programmes, 1889–1936.

A Book of Miracles. MS. No. 645 4to of the Arna-Magnæan Collection in the University Library of Copenhagen. With an introduction by Anne Holtsmark. Einar Munksgaard: Copenhagen, 1938.

The Holy Bible; The Whole Book of Psalms. London, 1640.

Thomas J. Wise. A Bibliography of the Writings in prose and verse of William Wordsworth. London, 1916. Corrected proof-sheets.

I.N. A Path-way to Patience. John Wolfe: London, 1591.

MARGARET DOWLING.

## SHORT NOTICE

**The Orkneyinga Saga.** A New Translation with Introduction and Notes by Alexander Burt Taylor. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1938. Pp. xviii (2)+446. 25s.

This is a good workman-like translation, without graces but without affectation, based on S. Nordal's text of 1916. A useful introduction takes up nearly a third of the volume and deals in the main with questions of textual study: a detailed discussion of the sources forms the largest section, but the place of composition and the date are also considered, as well as the problem of authorship—Dr. Taylor favours Sighvat Sturluson, but is not dogmatic—and the historical and literary value of the saga. The notes at the end are particularly valuable on the topographical side, and there is a series of useful appendices. The index includes place-names, personal names, and technical terms, and there are also three outline maps. The printing is careful on the whole, but there is one misprint near the beginning which must be set down to the special devil responsible for such matters.

E. C. B.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER

EDINBURGH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY TRANSACTIONS, Vol. I., Pt. 1  
(Session 1935-6)—

A bibliography of the works of Sir George Mackenzie, Lord Advocate,  
Founder of the Advocates' Library (F. S. Ferguson), pp. 1-60.

——— Vol. I., Pt. 2 (Session 1936-7)—

A bibliography of the Poetical Works of Sir Walter Scott, 1796-1832  
(William Ruff), pp. 99-239.

——— Vol. I., Pt. 3 (Session 1937-8)—

Notes on the printers and publishers of English Song-books, 1651-1702  
(Eleanore Boswell Murrie), pp. 241-76.

A bibliography of the Poetical Works of Sir Walter Scott, 1796-1832 :  
additions and corrections (William Ruff), pp. 277-81.

ELH, Vol. VI., No. 4, December 1939—

The so-called anonymous or earliest life of Milton (Allen R. Benham),  
pp. 245-55.

A suggestion that this was not the source of Wood's account but subsequent  
to it.

The philosophic basis of Coleridge's *Hamlet* criticism (Roberta  
Morgan), pp. 256-70.

The *Troilus* and Christian love (James Lyndon Shanley), pp. 271-81.

Chaucer's Squire (Ernest P. Kuhl and Henry J. Webb), pp. 282-4.

Chaucer's Plowman and the contemporary English peasant (Gardiner  
Stillwell), pp. 285-90.

John Wilson's election to the Professorship of Moral Philosophy, 1820  
(Alan Lang Strout), pp. 291-9.

Certain religious elements in the English doctrine of the inspired poet  
during the renaissance (Courtland D. Baker), pp. 300-23.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XXI., No. 6, December 1939—

Emily Dickinson, 1830-1886 (D. G. van der Vat), pp. 241-60.

*King Lear*—the moral aspect (J. M. Nosworthy), pp. 260-8.

"Feud" (Kemp Malone), pp. 269-71.

On the origin of the present-day spelling and pronunciation.

The Old English inscription on the Brussels Cross—Additional Note  
(S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne), pp. 271-2.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XXII., No. 1, February 1940—

The invasion of Switzerland and English public opinion, January to April 1798 (G. Bonnard), pp. 1-26.

TUDES ANGLAISES, Vol. III., No. 4, October-December 1939—

Anglo-French relations in *King John* (D. F. Ash), pp. 349-58.

Shakespeare's play as a mirror of the Anglo-French situation in 1595-6.

Un inédit de Walt Whitman (Jean Catel), pp. 359-60.

A Whitman fragment (in the Library of Congress) on Lucretius.

La dette de Shaw envers Samuel Butler: deux documents (Louis Eyrygnoux), pp. 361-4.

LIBRARY, Vol. XX., No. 3, December 1939—

Two Caxton problems (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 266-71.

1. On the resetting of type in the *Morte Darthur*: a solution to Professor Vinaver's problem (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXIII (1939), 102-6). 2. On the question of watermarks in Lydgate's *Lyf of our Lady*: an answer to Mr. Bosanquet (*Library*, XVII (1936), 362-3).

Cheap Repository Tracts: Hazard and Marshall edition (G. H. Spinney), pp. 295-340.

On the history of Hannah More's enterprise and the authorship of the tracts, with a bibliography.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIV., No. 8, December 1939—

The age of Isaac at the time of the sacrifice (Minnie E. Wells), pp. 579-82.

Conflicting traditions in English mystery plays.

Note on the text of *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (W. L. Halstead), pp. 585-9.

Izaak Walton, *prochein amy* (Arthur M. Coon), pp. 589-92.

New biographical material from wills and legal documents.

The authorship of *A Poem to the Memory of Mr. Congreve* (Alan D. McKillop), p. 599.

Evidence of Mallet's authorship of the poem generally ascribed to Thomson.

— Vol. LV., No. 1, January 1940—

A second version of John Day's *Peregrinatio Scholastica* (M. E. Borish), pp. 35-9.

On the Huntington Library (formerly Bridgewater) MS.

A possible source for the female disguise in Byron's *Don Juan* (Margaret E. McGing), pp. 39-42.

On the possible use of Miss Tully's *Tripoli*.

Moore to Hobhouse: an unpublished letter (Bradford A. Booth), pp. 42-5.

A letter of January 29, 1828, now in the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Los Angeles.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LV., No. 1, January 1940—

A manuscript addition to Hazlitt's Essay "On the Fear of Death" (Stewart C. Wilcox), pp. 45-7.

Burke's error regarding sugar-crystals (Dixon Wecter), pp. 47-50.  
A possible source in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*.

A borrower from Quarles and Herbert (Harold Reese), pp. 50-2.  
On J. H.'s *Miscellanea*, 1669.

Donne's *Paradoxes* in 1707 (George Reuben Potter), p. 53.

On borrowings from Donne in John Dunton's *Athenian Sport*, 1707.

Recent works on prose fiction before 1800 (Ernest Bernbaum), pp. 54-65.

## — No. 2, February 1940—

A note on the relation of the Corpus Christi procession to the Corpus Christi play in England (Lawrence Blair), pp. 83-95.

The English *Faust Book* and the date of Marlowe's *Faustus* (Paul H. Kocher), pp. 95-101.

*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. iii. 285-362 (Staring B. Wells), pp. 102-3.

Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 103-5.

Theobald's alleged Shakespeare manuscript (John Cadwalader), pp. 108-9.

The text of *Grobiana's Nuptials* (R. H. Bowers), p. 109.

Case-forms in—i in the oldest English texts (C. E. Bazell), pp. 136-9.

On *rodi* (Ruthwell Cross), the masc.-neuter instrumental, and *Uyrdi* (Leiden Riddle 9).

Notes on the Old English Charms (I. K. Shook), pp. 139-40.

The Myrgingas of *Widsith* (Kemp Malone), pp. 141-2.

Chaucer's Shipman's Tale and Sercambi (Robert A. Pratt), pp. 142-5.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXV., No. 1, January 1940—

The literary background of Francis Bacon's Essay "Of Death" (Marjorie Walters), pp. 1-7.

The Mouse-trap—a postscript (W. W. Greg), pp. 8-10.

*Volpone* and the reputation of Venetian justice (Richard H. Perkinson), pp. 11-8.

A note on *The Owl and the Nightingale* (J. W. H. Atkins), pp. 55-6.  
On ll. 1091-2.

Notes on the text of the Middle English romance *Ywaine and Gawain* (Wilfred Lister), pp. 56-9.

On ll. 186-90, 648-50, 1457-65, 3613-5.

"Bronstrops." A note on *A Faire Quarrell* (Margery Fisher), pp. 59-62.

"Warton" on the Rowley Papers (Geoffrey Tillotson), p. 62.

Evidence that the writer of the letter printed by Mr. Vincent (*M. L. R.*, XXXIV (1939), 572-5) was Thomas Wharton, Gray's friend and not the author of the *History of English Poetry*.

Some notes on German loan words in English (Charles T. Carr), pp. 69-71.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang XXV., Afl. 2, January 1940—

Some remarks on Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and his *Translations from the Old Testament* (A. A. Prins), pp. 112-22.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 177, December 2—

Poe's word "Porphyrogene" (T. O. Mabbott), p. 403.

— December 9—

Verses on the death of Scott (James C. Corson), pp. 417-9.

A chronological list.

Lafcadio Hearn (H. E. Rudkin), pp. 419-22.

On his antecedents; reply from W. W. Gill, January 13, p. 32.

A Minerva Press Chap-book (W. Roberts), p. 422.

Addendum to Miss Blakey's Bibliography.

— December 16—

The authorship of *King Leir* (William Wells), pp. 434-8.

— December 23—

Richard Hill of Hillend and Balliol MS. 354 (Wm. P. Hills), pp. 452-6.

— Vol. 178, January 6, 1940—

Notes on Chatterton: a letter from Isaac Fell (Thomas Ollive Mabbott), p. 3.

Notes on Johnson's movements in Scotland: suggested attributions to Boswell in the *Caledonian Mercury* (John Murray), pp. 3-5.

John Hookham Frere: translations of Aristophanes (Milton Millhauser), pp. 5-8.

Presentation copy of Tomkis's *Albumazar* (Hugh G. Dick), p. 10.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of an inscribed copy of one of the two 1615 quarto editions which belonged, in 1890, to one of the Leicestershire Shirleys.

— January 20—

An uncollected poem by William Browne of Tavistock (Geoffrey Tillotson), p. 43.

A commendatory poem prefixed to Mabbe's translation of Alemán's *The Rogue: or the Second Part of the Life of Guzman de Alfarache*, 1622.

— January 27—

Milton's English (George Coffin Taylor), pp. 56-7.

— February 3—

A Defoe allusion in *Gulliver's Travels* (John Robert Moore), pp. 79-80.

— February 10—

Shakespeare and the Tong epitaph (E. B. Goodacre), pp. 96-7.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 178, February 24, 1940—

The source of a poem by A. E. Housman (Demetrius Caclamanos), p. 133.

On *Last Poems*, xxxv, and the Greek Anthology, ix, 138.

Brant's *Narrenschiff* (Lawrence Thompson), p. 138.

An enquiry concerning the whereabouts of a copy of the 1563 Zürich edition.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. LIV., No. 4, December 1939—

The *Speculum Misericordie* (Russell Hope Robbins), pp. 935-66.

An account of this work, together with the text here printed for the first time from the Delamere MS.

The background of Lyly's *Tophas* (Daniel C. Boughner), pp. 967-73.  
Spenser's seven Bead-men and the corporal works of Mercy (Charles E. Mounts), pp. 974-80.

Classical material in Broadside Ballads, 1550-1625 (Herschel C. Baker), pp. 981-9.

Some interrelations of English dictionaries of the seventeenth century (Gertrude E. Noyes), pp. 990-1006.

Burton, Ford, and *Andromana* (S. B. Ewing, Jr.), pp. 1007-17.

*The Temple and The Christian Year* (Elbert N. S. Thompson), pp. 1018-25.

"A double Janus"—*Paradise Lost*, xi. 129 (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 1026-30.

The Cowper translation of Mme Guyon's poems (Dorothy Lloyd Gilbert and Russell Pope), pp. 1077-98.

Murphy's criticisms in the *London Chronicle* (John P. Emery), pp. 1099-104.

Poe and Lewis Gaylord Clark (Herman E. Spivey), pp. 1124-32.

Robert Bridges' concept of nature (J. Gordon Eaker), pp. 1181-97.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XVIII., No. 4, October 1939—

English almanacks of the fifteenth century (Russell Hope Robbins), pp. 321-31.

Coleridge's *Somerset*: a byway to Xanadu (Wylie Sypher), pp. 353-66.

David Garrick and the Burkes (Dixon Wecter), pp. 367-80.

A review of their relations, with unpublished letters.

Collaboration on *The Patient Grissill* (W. L. Halstead), pp. 381-94.

Some seventeenth-century Chaucer allusions (Brice Harris), pp. 395-405.

A possible classical source for the Blackamoor Maid (Cornelia C. Coulter), pp. 409-10.

Parallel motifs in Theocritus and Vergil; cf. *Philological Quarterly*, XVII (1938), 371-6.



## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

### STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXVII., No. 1, January 1940—

Some trends and problems in studies of the folk-tale (Archer Taylor), pp. 1-25.

Literary features of renaissance dictionaries (D. T. Starnes), pp. 26-50.

Swift and Gentillet (Denver Ewing Baughan), pp. 64-74.

Wordsworth's *Prelude*: the shaping spirit (Bennett Weaver), pp. 75-87.

A chip from Elia's workshop (J. Milton French), pp. 88-99.

Lamb's holograph draft of "Grace before Meat" (now in the Harvard College Library).

American plays in the Richmond theatre, 1819-1838 (Martin Staples Shockley), pp. 100-19.

Is *Pippa Passes* a dramatic failure? (J. M. Ariail), pp. 120-9.

The Rance Brooke and Joseph Conrad (John D. Gordan), pp. 130-2.

Cf. *Studies in Philology*, XXXV (1938), 613-34.

### TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 9, 1939.

*Longe Parvula* (Vincent J. Flynn), p. 717.

An unrecorded edition among Pepys' books wrongly described by Duff (*Fifteenth Century Books*, No. 373) and S. T. C. (No. 23,177) as Stanbridge's *Vocabula*.

#### — December 23—

Thomas Rymer (Curt A. Zimansky), p. 743.

On the non-biographical character of the "Description of the Miseries of a Garrettee Poet."

*Westward Ho!* (John Christie), p. 743.

A Bideford tradition that Kingsley's title was suggested by Dr. Acland.

#### — December 30—

Dr. Johnson's Mr. Thrale (James L. Clifford), p. 755.

A hitherto unpublished letter of Henry Thrale, October 24, 1749.

Cheap Repository Tracts (G. H. Spinney), p. 755.

A request for information concerning the collected volumes for 1796 and 1797 (Hazard and Marshall edition).

The Folio text of *Hamlet* (W. J. Lawrence), p. 760.

Reply from C. L. Stainer, January 6, 1940, p. 7.

#### — January 6, 1940—

The Temptation and Fall (Carleton Brown), p. 7.

Additional notes to *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century*. Reply from William Bliss, January 20, p. 31; from N. MacNicol, February 3, p. 59.

"Phoney," *sb.* (Arthur Machen), p. 7.

Replies from Eric Partridge and Daniel George, January 20, p. 31.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 13, 1940—

Characters in *Piers Plowman* (M. E. Richardson), p. 24.

On "Sire Hervy" (B Text, ed. Skeat, V. 189 *et seq.*) and a contemporary William Hervy.

## January 20—

The Minerva Press Canon (W. Roberts), p. 36.

Addendum to Miss Blakey's Bibliography.

## January 27—

*Imaginary Conversations* (M. F. Ashley-Montagu), p. 45.

On the source of Landor's form (Clara Reeve's *Progress of Romance*).

## February 3—

The duel scene in *St. Ives* (J. Aitken), p. 59.

A suggestion that Stevenson's scene was based on incidents at Penicuik. Replies from J. Thorn Drury, February 10, p. 73, and William F. Alexander, February 17, p. 87, pointing out that the source was the *Annual Register*.

## February 10—

H. P. Sturz and Dr. Johnson (H. L. Levy), p. 80.

A translation of Sturz's account of his meeting with Johnson in 1768.

## February 24—

A Swinburne MS. (Randolph Hughes), p. 99.

An enquiry concerning the ownership of an unprinted work, *The Chronicle of Tebaldeo Tebaldei*.

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY, Vol. IX., No. 2, January 1940—

Browning's poetry: fifty years after (William O. Raymond), pp. 138-

51.

Matthew Arnold and the eighteenth century (E. K. Brown), pp. 202-

13.

